DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 081 EA 002 677

AUTHOR	Dickinson, William E., Ed.
TITLE	New Dimensions in School Board Leadership; A Seminar Report and Workbook (Chicago, Illinois, July 9-12, 1969).
INSTITUTION	National School Boards Association, Evanston, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	123p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National School Boards Association, 1233 Central Street, Evanston, Ill. 60201 (Single copy $3.25, quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.25
DESCRIPTORS	Black Power, *Boards of Education, Communication (Thought Transfer), Community Influence, Community Involvement, *Educational Equality, Financial Support, *Leadership, Minority Groups, Public Education, *Public School Systems, Relevance (Education), School Integration, School Policy, Seminars, *Social Change, Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

A 4-day seminar, funded by ESEA Title III, studied the appropriate role of the American school board in the present climate of change, and the future role of the school board. Educational authorities were asked to prepare position papers for the seminar and persons with experience at the local board level were invited to respond candidly to all seminar presentations. Part I of this report contains six papers prepared for the seminar, covering such topics as problems of decentralization, fiscal policies, urban schools, and school board leadership. Eight broad ideas on new requirements for effective leadership are offered for consideration by the educational leadership community. Part II is a workbook that provides topics and quotations for further discussion. (MF)

ED035081

New Dimensions in School Board Leadership

A Seminar Report and Workbook

William E. Dickinson
Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 002 677

1969
NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, INC.
1233 Central Street Evanston, Illinois 60201

NEW DIMENSIONS IN SCHOOL BOARD LEADERSHIP

$3.25 per copy, or
four or more copies @ $3.00

Order from
National School Boards Association
1233 Central Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201

The seminar on New Dimensions in School Board Leadership was financed under Title III provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10) through an amendment grant made to the Elk Grove Training and Development Center, Arlington Heights, Ill. The seminar design was developed by the staff of the National School Boards Association and was conducted from July 9 to July 12, 1969, at the Marriott Motor Hotel in Chicago, Ill. Under terms of the contract, an allowable 225 project-funded copies were printed and distributed without charge to educational leaders. Additional copies were printed at the expense of the National School Boards Association to encourage the widest possible dissemination of seminar ideas. The seminar was conducted in full compliance with provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Preface

The local school board is a uniquely American invention and one of our democracy's taproot institutions. Today, the school board's role is in a state of transition. Changes are being wrought by factors which are often beyond the board's control but which could affect, for good or ill, the future of millions of American boys and girls.

To be sure, the board's role has evolved considerably over the years. In early America the main jobs of the "committees of school visitors" was to see to it that the schoolmaster was hired and that stove wood was stacked by the schoolhouse door. Once, the local school board exercised almost absolute control of local education. As the nation developed, however, so too developed our present system of modern public education with school governance responsibilities shared by local, state, and federal agencies.

The slow, orderly processes of evolution are no longer possible. Changes come today at a rapid pace. Never before have lay leaders of public education faced such a multitude of pressures and demands at all levels of our society.

The increased militancy of teachers and other school employees, keen competition with other governmental agencies for tax dollars, mounting pressures for curriculum reform, the emerging commitment of the schools to effect social changes — these are but a few of the problems which weigh heavily on school boards everywhere.

In this climate of change, what is the appropriate role of the American school board?

What should it be tomorrow?

To provide a forum for considering these questions in depth the National School Boards Association designed and with the help of the U.S. Office of Education and the Elk Grove Training and Development Center in Arlington Heights, Ill., held an intensive, four-day seminar on the topic, "New Dimensions in School Board Leadership." A select group of outstanding educational authorities were asked to prepare position papers, and an equal number of articulate, knowledgeable persons with considerable experience at the local board level were invited to respond candidly to all seminar presentations.

The seminar was held at the Marriott Motor Hotel in Chicago from July 9 to July 12, 1969. It proved to be an unusually exciting "think tank" experience, productive of many challenging ideas. This book is a report of that consortium.

Certainly, there are some things wrong about the procedures we use to administer education in America. Yet school boards do have a vital role to play in forging tomorrow's educational destiny — probably a more significant role than ever. Each of our communities is charged with the task of doing a better job of education than has ever before been attempted. We all must learn to expand our horizons and thinking. Perhaps the Chicago-Seminar will be remembered as an important first step in that direction.

I particularly commend to the reader's attention the brief but important workbook section of the report because the "Chicago Seminar" should be regarded as a beginning only. Hopefully, this publication will mark the start of a national dialog about the kind of school board leadership required for the 1970s.

I record here my warmest personal gratitude as well as the gratitude of the National School Boards Association to all seminar participants for their good and full contributions of wisdom, intelligence, and candor. No shibboleths were held sacred. All ideas were explored fully. And as a result, the Chicago Seminar was for me personally one of the most stimulating educational meetings in which it has been my privilege to participate.

Warm thanks are also due Mrs. Gloria Kinney, director of the Elk Grove Center, and to the Board of Education of Elk Grove District 59, Arlington Heights, Ill., for their assistance in making the seminar possible.

Harold V. Webb
Executive Director
National School Boards Association, Inc.

Contents

Preface

Harold V. Webb iii

PART I: THE SEMINAR

1. Seminar Overview: The Challenge of Leadership .. 9
William E. Dickinson

2. Needed: The Reform of a Reform 29
David H. Tyack

3. School Boards: Functional and Fiscal Relationships 52
H. Thomas James

4. City School Boards: What Can Be Done? 66
Roald F. Campbell

5. The Board's Role: Present and Future 81
Jerry Fine

6. New Dimensions in School Board Leadership 96
Stephen K. Bailey

PART II: THE WORKBOOK

Discussion Topics and Quotations 113

Reader-reaction Survey Form 117

APPENDIX

Seminar Participants and the Agenda 121

5/6

Part I
The Seminar

7/8

1. Seminar Overview: The Challenge of Leadership

WILLIAM E. DICKINSON

AUTHOR'S NOTE:
The papers prepared for the Chicago Seminar appear in the chapters that follow. This section attempts to summarize four days of lively, freewheeling discussion carried on by a group of intelligent and strong-minded men and women — individuals all. At the start of the Seminar, the participants agreed on a groundrule with this chapter in mind: All ideas would be considered "common property" so that the writer could be free to blend concepts and quotations in commentary fashion. I am most appreciative to these generous people for not *claiming their rightful coin — individual credit and attribution for everything they said.*

"Democracy, they say, is based on Equality. But in no other form of government is leadership so essential. A multitude without intelligent, responsible leaders whom it respects and follows is a crowd ready to become the prey of any self-seeking knave."[1]

James Bryce, the British historian-diplomat, spoke these words at Yale University in 1909.

The need for "intelligent, responsible" leadership for democracy's make-ready institutions, the public schools, has never been more urgent. School boards are on the front line in a war that's getting hotter. The nation's grave problems of race and poverty, the phenomenon of student unrest, the taxpayers revolt, teacher militancy — all these forces are testing the mettle (and the staying power) of the nation's school board members.

In addition, these times of social unrest and upheaval have brought new challenges to the traditional authority of school boards. The local board is supposedly in charge of the course of public education at the local level.

But is it? What about the influence of the state education bureaus, the state legislatures, the professional administrators, the teacher organizations, the emerging neighborhood action groups, the taxpayers leagues? What about Washington?

These, too, are power centers which help determine — for better or worse — the educational destinies of America's children.

On the eve of the 1970s the traditional role of the school board is in question; there is a crisis in authority at the local level of school governance.

The Chicago Seminar examined this crisis in depth. For four days in July, 1969, a small group of outstanding educational authorities and knowledgeable and articulate laymen closeted themselves in a Marriott Hotel conference room to respond thoughtfully and frankly to these questions:

What *is* the American school board today?

What can or should it be tomorrow?

If the "seminarians" agreed on anything, it was clearly this: the American school board today is in trouble.

School boards — which have considered it worthy all along to work for the unanimous vote, to establish consensus, and to promote harmonious board-staff-community "teams" — have few precedents for dealing with dissent, controversy, and today's hot issues. By and large, school boards are relatively unskilled as "managers of diversity and change."

Some boards are responding to the crisis by muddling through. In meeting after meeting, board members absorb themselves in matters of routine and trivia.

Many boards are not planning for change but rather simply reacting to the steady hammer-beat of one demand after another. They are in a state of "future shock."

There are good, earnest people on school boards everywhere. The talent pool has perhaps never been richer.

Yet the forces that militate against effective school board service are becoming almost overwhelming. The job in many communities large and small has become a back-breaker in terms of time and stress. Said one Seminar participant: "Gentlemen in public office tend to withdraw at times of public uproar." The observation may be true. Many potentially promising candidates for a seat on the board have said "Thanks but no thanks" in recent years to the call to serve; many experienced board members have dropped out of school service.

No school board has the right — the legal right — to give away its powers and responsibilities. But powers can be eroded away, and they can be taken away. Indeed, in the years since World War II there has been considerable slippage in school board authority. And there is no guarantee that the American school board might not become in time vestigial — a figurehead council that convenes on rare occasions to perform quaint ceremonial rites.

Nor should the school board be granted a guarantee against extinction. The survival of an institution doesn't really matter. What matters is the advancement of public education.

Next to the quest for peace, our nation's most important goal is the development of a high quality educational enterprise that will prepare all youngsters for life in a fast-changing and complex world. In the pursuit of this goal, the local school board does have a vital role to play.

But the role is changing, and no one can specify for sure the new requirements for effective leadership. Nevertheless, eight broad ideas on this subject did emerge from the Chicago Seminar discussions. They are posed below in "mandate form." But they are not, it should be noted, official statements of the National School Boards Association. They are, rather, a group of *general principles*, offered to the educational leadership community for further consideration. (See Part II — The Workbook.)

Let's consider the eight statements in detail.

1. SCHOOL BOARDS MUST BE POSITIVE FORCES FOR ADVANCING THE IDEAL OF THE OPEN SOCIETY.

There can be no alternative to the open society in America. The notion that every person born into or entering American life deserves an equal opportunity is fundamental to the American dream. This is the nation's prime social objective. It is a universalistic principle, written into our founding documents and notably restated in the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education.*

This notion is — or should be — the preemptive "school board policy" in the United States. But it is not. The idea of racial mixing galls vast segments of the white populace when its meaning is spelled out by compliance orders and legislation designed to further the ideals of equal opportunity in education. In reacting to the national policy of school desegregations many school boards have squirmed and turned and equivocated in response to white community pressure. As one Seminar participant expressed it, "School boards have tried to find out how far they could bend the law [on desegregation] and still get their money from Washington."

The words have been there. The moral preachments have been there. The directives to "teach citizenship" have been there. But courageous actions by many boards on behalf of the nation's forgotten millions — the blacks, the Indians, the Puerto Ricans, the migrants — have not been noticeable in comparison to all the rhetoric.[2]

Historic grievances are reaching the boiling point. Yet the old slums are as bad as ever, and new slum neighborhoods are being created from continuing neglect. The forces of poverty still erode the self-respect and the aspirations of countless children. Many teachers still regard assignment to ghetto schools as a banishment to Siberia instead of as a high challenge worthy of the best professional effort.

Now, the forgotten man has become noisy. People at the bottom of the social pyramid are pounding on the school board table, insisting that they be heard and harkened to. And very often they are not polite about it.

Yet the new activism on the part of the poor is, in a sense, what human dignity is all about — it is the refusal to let yourself be pushed down. "All that street violence," William Thomas told fellow Seminar participants, "is a cry that says, 'Listen to me!' "

School boards should learn how to listen — that, at least, is a start. Some school board members may not like what they hear. But if they listen, they will quickly be awakened to the fact that we are indeed a pluralistic society.

They will also learn that only in recent years has public education really tried to "go public." Only since World War II have we tried to shift gears from an educational program for the elite and the middle class to an educational program for all. No one, of course, intended the old system to be educationally discriminatory. It just happened. It was the result of the way we pay for education. Those communities that could afford good schools got good schools; those that could not afford good schools got inferior schools. Since privileged people lived in the wealthier communities, they were able to "buy" a better grade of education for their children.

In a sense, then, the great adventure of *public* education has just begun.

Black organizations in the cities may be the most visible group pressuring for change. Black pressure, it is said, was an important factor in getting passage of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Black pressure has also brought about reforms in the policies, practices, and positions of a number of "establishment" education organizations — from the PTA National Congress to the NEA to the NSBA.[3] Yet it would be a serious mistake to stereotype the struggle for a more open society by seeing it as a racial struggle. Blacks have reminded the nation of its ideals of equality. But building a democracy is everyone's job — white and black, and in the final analysis, the benefits of freedom accrue to everyone.

There are many circumstances in American society that are not right and that must be corrected. The demand is for courageous leadership. School boards can no longer be satisfied with what is. In its proper sphere, the school board must act to redress long-standing educational grievances. More than any other quality, a deep moral committment to democratic ideals will be the *first* requirement for school board service in the 1970s.

2. SCHOOL BOARDS MUST HELP IN THE CREATION OF A MORE HUMAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

In 1969 the United States placed men on the moon and took snapshots of Mars. In 1969 the Great Student Uprising took on epidemic proportions.

Clearly, the schools and colleges of the nation deserve high honors for their contribution to fantastic technological accomplishments. But how well are they doing in the care and feeding of the human ego? Do they truly "remember the kids" and assign priority to the personal needs of the individual? The student rebels think not.

The ranks of the rebels — in the high schools as well as the colleges — are growing. And their numbers include some of our brightest boys and girls — young people of promise who are eschewing conventional school clubs in order to crank out underground newspapers, to experiment with pot, to turn on to psych-rock music, and to launch protests of school policies.

To this kind of youngster, school is a bore. It is a processing plant where students are card-sorted, graded, and programed into so many slots for a society they regard as sick.

Many of these youngsters (not all, certainly) see their's as a moral cause. They think of themselves as "the first virtuous generation," morally superior to adults who bequeathed to them smog, polluted rivers, napalm, the H-bomb, and nerve gas.[4] On issues like war, race, and "participatory democracy," their most extreme leaders seem like single-minded Jeremiahs.

True, there are aspects of the youth rebellion that many adults regard as offensive (the childish preoccupation with four-letter words) or even dangerous (the use of drugs). Yet school board members would be wise to look beyond symptoms to causes. The very fact of widespread student alienation is a red flag signal that the schools are missing the mark in reaching large numbers of young people.

Perhaps school boards have been too unbending at times.

In the cities, if black students "demand" an observance of the birthday of Malcolm X, should this be denied because Malcolm X is not yet enshrined in the American history textbook? Should not the school board welcome diverse folk heroes? Should not the school board be hospitable to student ideas and student initiative concerning the course of their own education?

And when matters get rough, is expulsion the only proper response to disruptive acts? We have laws against the (physical) maiming of children. Yet when a school board expels a student from school (or allows him to drop out), it may maim him for life in terms of his earning power and his eventual capacity to develop as a responsible citizen.

Such matters relate to the job of creating a more human educational system. So, too, do the relevancy of the curriculum, the on-going quality of instruction, the school's élan vital. The spirit of inquiry and independent study; a demonstration that the school *is* concerned with the individual human psyche and to factors of human worth; that it is concerned with society's human needs — these are all essential to the task.

3. SCHOOL BOARDS MUST BECOME MANAGERS OF SOCIAL CHANGE AND CONTROVERSY.

Today's world is not programed for yesterday's school board.

Yesterday's board tended too frequently to avoid controversy at all costs. Board members found it more comfortable to be supportive of one another than to dissent. Well aware that everything in the school enterprise interlocked, school boards found it more convenient not to disturb the status quo than to change one component only to disturb the total "system." It was easier to become lost in detail than to delve into problems. When threatened by outside forces, it was easier for the board-administrative team to hang in there together, to form a circle, to put heads down defensively and hope trouble would pass.

Today, trouble is the name of the game, and change and conflict are inevitables to be dealt with constantly. Today, school boards have to deal with impatient, angry constituents who are demanding instant solutions to almost impossible problems. There is no time left for leisurely deliberations behind closed doors of what "we might do some day." The work of today's board is often carried on before the eyes of raucous onlookers who want satisfaction *now*.

If leadership is to have meaning in the 1970s, the American school board will have to learn how to manage change and not just react to it. It will have to learn how to nose out conflict and not hide from it. "Education is a series of problems to be solved," said the wise school principal. "And if I haven't found a problem to be solved by 10 a.m., I'm not doing my job." *That* is the kind of positive thinking the times require of board members.

In other words, the times require that schools boards take the offensive and not let themselves be pushed against the wall. They require clear thinking and intelligent actions on behalf of their *total* constituency. After all, what the board's various publics seek is a voice in their own affairs. Their basic question is most always, "Are you doing everything you can for *my* child's education?"

How can the school board become managers of change and controversy? The Chicago Seminar produced a number of suggestions:

(1) Develop many kinds of pipelines of communication, and keep them open to many kinds of people and groups — the poor, the privileged, the business community, the labor unions, and that large but often ignored power bloc, the so-called lower middle class. This latter group includes those "upward mobility" families in the $5000- to $10,000-a-year bracket. Characteristically they are among the first to resent the need for change. They need to be informed about school needs continually, not just at referendum time.

(2) Anticipate the need for change. This can be done if school boards listen to the background noise in their communities — the day-to-day rumblings. Sooner or later, this noise gets sorted out. Some of it becomes articulated in the form of new demands. School boards can't afford to wait for these kinds of surprises. They should make it possible for their administrative staffs to get the facts, collect the data, and place emerging problems on the agenda as early as possible for consideration and action *before* community demands reach the point of no return. In this fast-changing world, one of the school board's most important duties is to decrease the response time in acting to meet legitimate needs.

(3) Be sensitive to value systems other than those of the predominate middle class. Get into other people's shoes to see how the board's own values and goals hold up in the light of diverse needs. Continued insensitivity leads to trouble.

(4) Mobilize as many people and groups as possible to work on solutions to educational problems. Provide opportunities for community involvement in the development of school policy. Public interest and public scrutiny is almost invariably more beneficial for education than apathy. Let the people have a chance to share the same frustrations that board members face in meeting after meeting. Give them the chance to learn that

their easy answers to problems are not so easy after all. Let them share the responsibility to find viable solutions.

(5) Provide both on the board and between the board and its publics many opportunities for free and open discussions, for differing opinions, for dissenting views. The urge to dissent is healthy. The give-and-take of good minds brings out the best thinking of any group. Accept the fact, however, that give-and-take discussions will produce more split votes than unanimous decisions on key issues. Accept the fact that men and women of goodwill can and will differ on matters of principle.

(6) Accept the phenomenon of the board-as-a-buffer. A place to ventilate anger is useful and necessary in a heated up society like ours. Regardless of how tough it is to take personally, it is clearly better for an outraged citizens group to yell "Bubblehead!" at the school board than to vent its anger in street violence. The slings and arrows will come. Chances are always excellent that some faction in the community will always be angry at the school board about something.

(7) And here's an idea: Find places other than the board room to fight and to thrash out issues. It *is* hard to stand before the lights at an open board meeting and make an on-the-spot decision five minutes after the public petition. Instead, why not sponsor public forums and town meetings as means to get a sounding on issues? Why not put school publications, the news media, and the committee machinery to better use so that only seasoned opinions and recommendations come before the board for formal action? Also when dealing with controversial proposals, why settle for one option only? Why not develop two or three competing ideas for testing and piloting?

In summary, listen, and talk, and negotiate. School boards must not, of course, give in to every demand, and they should never rule out automatically any demand.

Change and controversy are not going to come in comfortable fashion under Board Rules A, B, and C. The leadership job of coping with change and controversy in a democracy is tough, no question about it. As Churchill said, "Democracy is the worst damn form of government — except all others that have ever been tried."

4. THE SCHOOL BOARD MUST WORK CREATIVELY WITH MANY OTHER AGENCIES THAT ARE ALSO IN THE "EDUCATION BUSINESS."

The public schools are the largest but certainly not the only agencies in the big business of educating the young. Church schools and school systems; independent day and boarding schools; private nurseries; private storefront academies; training programs run by business and industry; government schools; programs run by such groups as Y's, camps, and Scouting organizations; even the instructional programs run by reformatories, mental hospitals, and sanatoria — all are part of the vast array of arrangements society has made to make sure that the educational job gets done.

This fact of diversity tells school board members something important: *When certain educational needs are not or can not be met by established means, society will invent new agencies to meet these needs.* The creation of the Catholic school system in the 19th century, the World War I beginnings of the military's vocational training activities, and current manpower training programs are cases in point.

Today, control of education is widely distributed. Anti-poverty governing bodies were given the job of running many of the first Head Start programs. Private industry is getting federal contracts to run the manpower programs. The line between the public and private sector in education is becoming quite blurred. And within the urban public education system, the yeast of decentralization is at work to give more people a voice in the decisionmaking process.

Obviously, no school board today is an island, entire of itself. No board can meet its own particular set of responsibilities without working constructively with all kinds of other agencies, like those mentioned above and also with those that are not primarily in education — the welfare department, for example, or the housing, redevelopment, and health agencies in the community.

Whether they like it or not, all such groups — including the school board — are locked together in a partnership relationship. Despite their diverse methodologies, despite their competition for financial support, despite their occasional squabbles, all have been charged by society, to carry out needed missions on behalf of children, youth, and adults. The total mission suffers when there is confusion, duplication, and dissension; it prospers where there is communication, interconnections, and cooperation.

It is at this point where the school board can serve a highly creative role. As a long-established occupant of the community's center stage, it is in a unique position for taking the initiative in advancing the cause of mutual planning, coordination, and execution of the total, interlocking educational mission. Vis-a-vis the other partners-in-education, the school board can serve as an "enabling agency" that helps catalyze total community progress.

This new role will require, of course, open-mindedness to new ideas and practices, high talent in the art of mediating differences, and skill at getting diverse groups to work together. In other words, it will require leadership.

5. SCHOOL BOARDS MUST USE POLITICAL MUSCLE IN GETTING THE MONEY NEEDED FOR EDUCATION.

The financial bind on education is tight now. It will get worse. School boards can't beat the present system for funding education. The system will have to be changed. It will take a lot of political savvy and hard work to change the system. School boards have lots of potential political clout. They have to learn how to use this power so that needed reforms will come to pass in the field of school finance.

These kinds of ideas were woven into the warp and woof of the Chicago Seminar discussion. Repeatedly, the participants said: School boards must spend more time on developing long-range strategies for getting money to meet the needs of education. Without adequate financial support, there is no hope of solving education's many and varied problems.

The United States, the world's richest nation, should be able to pay for the kind of schools the times require. But two factors work against efforts to get adequate financial support. The allocations of public monies are tragically out of kilter. The antiquated system of raising school funds — which puts a disproportionate burden on local property taxes — is rapidly becoming unworkable.

Take the allocations. It costs about $7500 a year to retrieve the dropout via Job Corps retraining. It costs about $3500 a year to hold a delinquent youth in jail. It costs about $2500 a year to sustain a child on welfare. Yet in comparison to these expenses, the annual investment in public education is at the rate of about $650 per pupil.

Take the system of raising school funds. It is based on the absurd proposition that the majority of citizens will voluntarily impose higher school taxes on themselves year after year. "In our district," said one of the Seminar participants, "they show up in wheel chairs to vote 'No' at school board bond and budget elections. It's the only chance local taxpayers get to vote against taxes and to vent their frustration at spiraling inflation." The resistence of taxpayers nation-wide is a clear signal that the property-tax system is breaking down. The broadest possible tax base is required to raise school revenues in amounts sufficient to the needs of the '70s.

To get a broader money base for education, school boards will have to shelve the notion that school board members should be "above politics." The paternalistic view of politics as a dirty game won't do in today's society where critical educational decisions are hammered out in the money committees of Congress and the legislative halls at the state capitol.

"Politician," said Dr. Stephen K. Bailey at the Seminar, "is really an ennobling word. It takes guts to be a politician."

It also takes lots of skill and sophistication. School boards together, working through their state and national associations, *are* learning the rules of the game. School board spokesmen are beginning to get a hearing and they are beginning to get action. But as one school board lobbyist said recently, "We are walking through the Washington thicket in short pants, and we are getting badly scratched." There is still a lot of learning left to do.

School board politicians (O.K. — let's start using that term) can learn much, for example, from the farmers and the unions, including the teachers unions, on how to muster facts and figures, how to build public support for legislation, how to pack the hearings, how to unleash the letter-writers, how to horse-trade when necessary, how to draft bills, how to get amendments tacked onto amendments, and, quite possibly, how to gently twist the arm of reluctant lawmakers.

Power is the name of the game. That fact can't be dodged or beautified. But idealism is the vital ingredient in the politics of a democratic society. In the words of various Seminar participants:

"Political strategy has two components — articulating worthy goals and getting out the troops to win the battle."

"The successful politician knows both the goodness and weakness in human nature — and he uses both qualities to gain his ends."

"We have a talent in America for preserving ideological principles while devising new pragmatic strategies for achieving them."

That's politics.

School boards work from an enviable base for launching political operations. School board members enjoy as much if not more public exposure than the mayor. They provide a service that everyone wants — education. (No one is really against education — but many people do have to be persuaded to spend money for it.) They represent many people. In fact, many school districts are larger than Congressional districts. There is no reason for any school board to suffer from a political inferiority complex. They have the muscle for serving as political gladiators for education.

6. SCHOOL BOARDS WORKING TOGETHER MUST GUIDE AND GOAD THE UNIVERSITIES INTO PRODUCING THE SCHOOL EXECUTIVE TALENT THE TIMES DEMAND.

The choice of a school superintendent has always been one of the school board's most solemn and impressive responsibilities. Making the best choice is more important than ever. And if school boards are going to get the kind of executive talent they need for these crisis times, they may soon have to start posting classifieds that look like this:

School Superintendent Wanted

Must have strong background and experience in the fields of school administration, curriculum development, sociology, group dynamics, psychology, corporate management, personnel management, conflict mediation, negotiations, public relations, human relations, law, political science, practical politics, and a half dozen disciplines we'll think of later. Long hours. Little time for golf. No tenure.

Supermen, of course, are fictions of the imagination. Yet the superintendency has become a job that places almost superhuman demands on professional school administrators. And school superintendents are generally the first to admit that their training has just not been adequate to the tasks assigned. In fact, at the Chicago Seminar, the sharpest criticism of university training programs in school administration came from a university dean, Moderator B. J. Chandler. "The universities," he said, "are preparing superintendents to deal in managerial minutiae. Today's school superintendents need an array of talents that just aren't being developed by the graduate schools."

As the employing agent, the nation's school boards have every right to speak with louder voice in helping to articulate and shape the requirements of the superintendency today. Working through their state and national associations, school boards should guide and goad the universities to upgrade both their preservice and inservice training programs.[5]

If the universities don't respond to this need, the American school board may have to start looking outside the field of public school administration for the kind of executive talent it needs. In fact, serious proposals have already been made to big city school boards to consider searching the ranks of the business magnates, the army brass, and foundation presidents for men of stature to serve as school superintendents.

It is said that the "good" administrator was once trained not to notice things he couldn't do anything about. This won't be a characteristic of any new-style executive, the kind who would emerge to the top position from a tougher, more demanding more rigorous training regimen. Hopefully, he would be a leader. Hopefully, he would be prepared to take courageous stands on moral issues — and he would expect the board to back him fully and not leave him exposed and alone to face the public wrath. Hopefully, he would test his board on occasion by proposing "impossible" and visionary programs. There would be honest differences between this kind of lead administrator and his board. He would assume that his board would want his best thinking. He would refuse to function as a glorified errand boy.

7. SCHOOL BOARDS MUST HELP RECRUIT, TRAIN, AND FIND WAYS TO RETAIN THE KIND OF BOARD MEMBERS THE TIMES DEMAND.

The attributes of the "effective school board member" are listed in every school board association handbook. Any of these catalogs of human virtues will do nicely to describe what's needed for the 1970s. There is no need here to reiterate the litany. Three qualities will suffice for special remark:

Grey matter. Society needs school board members with brains — people who can probe ideas and proposals analytically, who can shift from one kind of problem to another and from one style of thinking to another.

Goodwill. Society needs school board members who are people of compassion who will work on behalf of *all* children.

Guts. Society needs school board members who will be hardliners for what's right, men and women who will stand up and be counted.

Tomorrow's school board member (and he is desperately needed today) will be expected to stand tall. Yet true giants — the Jefferson and Lincoln types — are in short supply. The talents of even the best among us are quite modest compared to the awesome challenges. Society will therefore have to be satisfied with a big self-improvement project in the board member line rather than with the invention of new model human beings. ("When we rail about the failure of school boards," said one of the Seminar participants, "we forget the fact that the people now devoting themselves to school board service may well be the best available for the job. The school boards associations should give support to these people and also provide better ways of helping them upgrade their skills as public servants.")

At the present time, a 25% turnover rate exists on school boards. This means that the average board requires complete retraining every four years. Or — put another way — each year one out of four board members is new and therefore needs complete orientation and indoctrination in his duties and responsibilities. The short life cycle of the average board member just doesn't offer enough time to educate him properly while he is on the job. As soon as he gets experience and starts making a major contribution he is apt to quit — because of the pressures, perhaps, or because the job is too time-consuming. The leadership identification-and-training process has to begin much earlier, and the school board's on-the-job training has to be more than an occasional regional workshop or supper meeting.

Leadership development — this is truly an important agenda item for the American school board. What can be done?

School boards can do much to nurture leadership talent in the ranks of their own citizens committees and lay advisory bodies.

They can see to it that laymen come into school service with their eyes wide open, knowing that while such service can be imminently rewarding the going can also get terribly rough.

Individually, school board members can get involved in helping party chiefs and/or nominating committees put the highest priority on the selection of candidates. They can be alert to the development of leaders in both the traditional voluntary associations (League of Women Voters, PTA Councils, etc.) as well as in the newer anti-poverty and neighborhood action groups.

Collectively, board members can work through their state association in the development of inservice workshops and clinics in such sophisticated areas as sensitivity training, conflict management, and school board policymaking.

In addition to the recruitment and training of able people for board service, there remains the matter of retaining them once they are on the board. Too many present practices are wasteful of leadership talent. Meetings that drag on after midnight, emergency sessions, busywork, the abundance of detail to be attended to — all these factors wear down even the most ambitious board member. Today, it is not uncommon at all for conscientious laymen to log as much as ten to 15 hours a week in school service.

It is the *quality* of the time investment that counts, not the quantity. If better directed and managed, school board meetings can be shorter, less frequent — and more productive. Many boards could profitably make better use of their administrative staffs. Certain functions could be assigned to appropriate citizens committees. Consultants could be retained to carry on needed research and to draft proposals. Many boards would find more time for important matters if they would stop playing games like

"Lets Read the Invoices" or "Now We Will Secondguess the Superintendent." Also, the writing of policies that allow administrative discretion in dealing with routine would open up blocks of time. And with more time, school boards could direct their attention to such top management tasks as the development of goals, the establishment of priorities, the identification of problem areas, the evaluation of staff and program, and the quest for better financial support.

8. SCHOOL BOARDS MUST HOLD THEMSELVES CHIEFLY ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE QUALITY OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The school board makes policy; the administration executes it. This is a nice, neat division of responsibility — on paper. But the line is not holding fast. The public is less and less inclined to differentiate between who is responsible, board or profession, for a given problem. Citizens, especially in the cities, are bypassing the superintendent's office and taking their grievances right into the board room. The public is holding the board itself accountable. The buck stops at the board room door.

It isn't fair, of course. Perhaps as much as 80 to 90% of what school boards do is predetermined by (a) state law; (b) federal guidelines; (c) negotiated agreements; and (d) budget limitations. But to quibble about what's fair is useless. Some one agency must take prime responsibility for education, and if accountability is thrust upon the school board it would be well-advised to accept that responsibility — and then to proceed in acting accordingly.

In this respect, some school boards have a lot of remedial work to do if they are to reclaim control. They have allowed rules and customs to accrete like barnacles. They have perpetuated conditions as they found them and have not insisted on setting higher goals. They have made excuses for deficiencies in school offerings. They have settled for minimum standards pronounced by the bureau edicts rather than pursued paths of excellence. They have been slow to evaluate programs and people, seldom employing the scalpel to cut out deadwood. They have gone along with the worship of credentials to the point where they are as "degree happy" as the rest of society.

The demand, once again, is for leadership, not whipping boys. The school board that holds itself accountable will insist on being kept informed about the total school program. It will insist on getting continuous evaluations of staff and program, and it will be responsive to the public's growing insistence on knowing what is being done with all the personnel and material resources being poured into the school endeavor.

The accountable school board will also exercise a healthy scepticism regarding long-standing practices — like the seniority system for determining promotions, for example.

And it will stop playing musical chairs with the board presidency. The board that is truly trying to exercise leadership will put the best man (or woman) in the president's chair and keep him there. The practice of taking turns and using longevity to determine the board presidency is a sad commentary on the board's own respect for leadership.

To say that the accountable school board will get more deeply involved in the total school endeavor is not to promote administrative meddling by board members or the abolishment of the school board-school administration distinction. The Chicago Seminar considered — and just about rejected out of hand — the idea that school boards should have investigatory staffs of their own, administrative aides who would be answerable to the board directly and not to the superintendent. A "monstrous idea," said one participant.

Yet this matter of accountability does suggest that boards and superintendents together do have to esablish new and resourceful ways of working together. It suggests, too, that the process of board policy development and administrative execution of policy is a much more complex, delicate, and sophisticated activity than textbooks suggest.

Policy development is a process that recognizes many antecedent movements that come to the board's attention. It involves many forces beyond the board's control. No school board makes policy in isolation from these antecedent movements and forces. Yet the board that holds itself accountable can exercise considerable power at the crucial moment. Boards do indeed initiate policy, but equally important, they serve as vital policy brokers and policy adjudicators. The school board's final policy determination represents key decisions that unlock many other decisions and actions. In this context, policy development remains one of the paramount responsibilities of responsible school boards.

• • • • •

Certainly the possibility must be considered that the school board will not be up to the tasks ahead. Perhaps in time it will become an honorific body only, a kind of local House of Lords, devoid of real power or influence.

Yet this fate is not inevitable. Nor is it wished for by a nation that has since its beginning put its trust in the *public* determination of *public* education.

"When did you see the light?" the school board member was asked.

"I didn't see it," he replied. "I felt the heat."

People and institutions change. They have a common memory pool that reminds them of their ancient values. When the pool is stirred, they act responsibly.

"As we mature we progressively narrow the scope and variety of our lives," John Gardner has said. "Of all the interests we might pursue, we settle on a few. Of all the people with whom we might associate, we select a small number. We get caught in a web of fixed relationships. We develop set ways of doing things."

Set ways won't do.

Try newer ways.

David Tyack reminded the Seminar of possible new methods that have been proposed for attacking urban school problems — the possibility of creating a "free market in education" through the use of tuition vouchers given to parents; the possibility of contracting out tasks to the education industries as a kind of "moon shot" in education; the development of school programs which cross metropolitan boundaries.[6]

Get something going. Innovate. Try it. And hope in heaven's name there is no hidden bomb in it.

Once again, words spoken to Americans by the British historian Bryce 60 years ago apply today:

Surely no country makes so clear a call upon her citizens to work for her as yours does. Think of the wide-spreading results which good solid work produces on so vast a community where everything achieved for good in one place is quickly known and may be quickly imitated in another. Think of the advantages for the development of the highest civilization which the boundless resources of your territory provide. Think of the principle of the sovereignty of the People which you have carried further than it was ever carried before and which requires and inspires and, indeed, compels you to endeavor to make the whole people fit to bear a weight and discharge a task such as no other multitude of men ever yet undertook. . . . You have unequalled opportunities for showing what a high spirit of citizenship may do.[7]

NOTES

[1] James Bryce, *The Hinderances to Good Citizenship* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909), p. 40.

[2] An interesting commentary on school boards and equal opportunity in the education field: In one of our most populous and most highly industrialized states, there are 564 superintendents of schools. Only one is Jewish and only one is Negro.

[3] For example, in response to black caucus action at NSBA's annual convention, the association's Directors in June, 1969, authorized the planning of new services related to the problems of minorities.

[4] The idealism of rebellious youth is reflected in the results of a *Fortune* poll in which some 40% of the student dissidents reported that they wanted to work in some field of education. Presumably, these students view the schools as fertile ground for social reform.

[5] A basis exists for concerted board action. NSBA has representation on the "big three" organizations in this area — the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, the National Council for Accreditation and Teacher Education, and the National Academy for School Executives.

[6] The following articles deal with some of these ideas: Theodore R. Sizer, "The Case for a Free Market," *Saturday Review*, January 11, 1969, 34-42, 93; Christopher Jencks, "Who Should Control Education?" *Dissent*, XIII (March-April, 1966), 145-163; Kenneth Clark, "Alternative Public School Systems," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXVIII (Winter, 1968), 100-113; and Vincent F. Conroy, "Metropolitanism: Hartford as a Case Study," Harvard Graduate School of Education Association, *Bulletin*, XII (Winter, 1967), 4-8.

[7] Bryce, *op cit*, pp. 133-4.

2. Needed: The Reform of a Reform

DAVID B. TYACK

In 1936, Jodie Foote, a black school board member in Myrtle, Mississippi, wrote this letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

> I am writen you concerning our school at was burn down some time ago we tried to get ade from the state. The state supt said it was not any funds on hand for that purpos. We tried the C.W.A. and failed. Then we tried the W.P.A. but we was the forgoten man. We have been teaching in a old out house. We have the boteing, got the foundation laid we are asking ade to get a cover flowing windows. We would like to seal it over head. Some of white friends have hpe us. Please send us a little ade for the McDowell school. We are going to have the names printed in our country paper all who help so we will never forget you for ading.[1]

In increasing numbers today, the poor refuse to be forgotten, the black to be invisible, the dispossessed to be powerless. Amid affluence for the majority undreamed of in the depths of the great depression, we now face a social upheaval which threatens to tear the nation apart.[2] Thus I would like to discuss the relations between school boards and the urban poor, the non-white, and the dispossessed.

In this group of forward-looking colleagues, I suppose that I am the only person paid each month for looking backwards. When the world changes as fast as it has in our lifetime, people naturally wonder how pertinent history can be to our present choices of policy. Yet short memories trap us all, and to me one of the values of examining the past is to regain a sense of surprise, to avoid taking our present attitudes and institutions for granted. We are often unwitting captives of history. We retain ingrained values past the time when they are appropriate. Norms relevant to one situation may no longer be functional, yet we find it hard to abandon them. Accordingly, I should like to trace the historical development of such values as professionalization, bureaucratication, and a-political control of schools.[3] Then I should like to examine some alternatives which may hold promise for our troubled cities.

Reform Ideology at the Turn of the Century

Imagine, if you will, a gathering of people concerned about urban education during the period from 1890-1910. I shall take the liberty of putting questions to this panel of experts. Their answers are direct quotations from their speeches and printed works.[4]

D.T. Mr. Jones, you have had a great deal of practical experience as a teacher and as a superintendent in Indianapolis and Cleveland. What do you see as the major problem today in urban education?

L. H. Jones. The unscrupulous politician is the greatest enemy that we now have to contend with in public education. His highest conception of the public school is that its revenues offer him the opportunity of public plunder. Did he accomplish his end without other injury to the cause of education than the depletion of its revenues, he might be ranked merely with the common thief. However, he pushes his corrupting presence into the school itself.[5]

D.T. I believe that you have with you a number of letters from school administrators across the country which refer to this problem of political corruption. Would you kindly share some of these with us?

Jones. A superintendent in one of the Eastern States writes: "Nearly all the teachers in our schools get their positions by political 'pull.' If they secure a place and are not backed by political influence, they are likely to be turned out. Our drawing teacher recently lost her position for this reason." One writes from the South: "Most places depend on politics. The lowest motives are frequently used to influence ends." A faint wail comes from the far West: "Positions are secured and held by the lowest principles of corrupt politicians." "Politicians wage a war of extermination against all teachers who are not their vassals," comes from the Rocky Mountains.[6]

D.T. Mr. Wetmore, you have been a school committeeman in Boston. Have you had similar experience?

S. A. Wetmore. The teachership is still a spoil of office. It is more difficult, at the present time, for a Catholic than for a Protestant young woman to get a place, but, nevertheless, some Catholics secure appointments, for "trading" may always be done, while each side has a wholesome fear of the other assailing it in the open board. A member said one day, in my hearing: "I must have my quota of teachers."[7]

D.T. Mr. Cubberley, from your vantage point as a professor at Stanford, how does San Francisco fare?

Ellwood P. Cubberley. The worst kind of boss rule has prevailed in San Francisco, and the board of education gradually became a place sought by those who wished to use the position for political preferment or for personal ends. Once every six or eight years there would be an effort at reform, and a few good men were elected; but they were usually in a minority, and the majority, held together by "the cohesive force of plunder," ruled things with a high hand.[8]

D.T. Probably most of you could tell similar stories of corruption. How do you explain this problem?

Cubberley. These Southern and Eastern Europeans (in our cities are) of a very different type from the North and West Europeans who preceeded them. Largely illiterate, docile, often lacking in initiative, and almost wholly without the Anglo-Saxon conceptions of righteousness, liberty, law, order, public decency, and government, their coming has served to dilute tremendously our national stock and to weaken and corrupt our political life.[9]

D.T. Mr. Draper, as you know, is superintendent of schools in Cleveland. What were you about to say?

Andrew S. Draper. It is a suggestive fact, that the only real progress in the direction of municipal reform has been made through the imposition of limitations upon the common suffrage.[10]

D.T. As I understand what you gentlemen are saying, the caliber of American citizens has been declining, and this helps to account for the corruption we see in school politics. But why haven't the conscientious citizens taken control? Mr. Ernst, what has been your experience in Boston?

George A. O. Ernst. For some years there had been a growing dissatisfaction at the character of party nominations for the School Board. This was not wholly the fault of the party managers. All sorts of charges of dishonesty and incompetence were made against members, and it became rather discreditable than otherwise to accept what ought to be one of the most honorable positions within the gift of the people. One of the most distinguished members has said: "For five years, I served on the Boston Board with a gentleman of high character, a graduate of Harvard University, who sacrificed time and money in order that he might fullfil the sacred duty that had been committed to him; and yet he told me that often when he met his friends they would sneer at him for his sacrifices and throw contempt upon what they were pleased to call his being in politics."[11]

D.T. I don't quite understand how it is possible for laymen to extort such graft from schools. Is there something defective with the plan of organization of school boards? Mr. Boykin, in your work at the U.S. Bureau of Education you have studied this matter. Would you tell us how school boards are selected?

James C. Boykin. The possible variations are as great in number as the combinations on the chessboard. The New York board controls the schools of over a million and a half of people, yet it numbers only 21 members, while Pittsburgh, with a population of about a quarter of a million, has 37 members in a central board and 222 in local boards. There are 7 members of the Minneapolis board, while Hartford, with only a third as many inhabitants, has 39 school visitors and committeemen. The first boards were chosen at popular elections and the members were ward representatives. This has not always worked well. The local feeling in members has often prevented them from appreciating any interests other than those of their own districts; and local politicians of small caliber have crept in from out-of-the-way wards, and have made things very unpleasant in various ways. To avoid these things, in many cities the board is elected from the city at large and not as representatives of any particular locality. In other places the mayor appoints the board, often with the advice and consent of the council. But alas, for human devices! instances have often occurred in which both methods of selection have proved to be as objectionable as ward elections, for there are big politicians as well as little ones.[12]

D.T. Mr. Ernst, you have seen how the Boston school committee worked prior to the attempted reforms in 1897. Would you tell us about it?

George A. O. Ernst. The superintendent and the supervisors had very few executive duties. The schools were governed by the inherently vicious system of sub-committees. There were no less than thirty of these sub-committees, with a total membership of 142. The city was divided into nine geographic divisions, and for each division a "committee in charge" was appointed. Each locality had its old-time traditions and rights which were asserted freely. Thus for years the "second division" had its own text-book on geography, absolutely distinct from that used anywhere else in Boston. The schools were burdened with provincialism in its most extreme and flagrant form. The committees were petty despots, jealously guarding their prerogatives.[13]

D.T. We have heard a lot about the evils of the old system. What can we do about it? As a newspaperman, Mr. Deweese, what is your perspective?

Truman A. Deweese. The perfect system of school adminstration has not yet been devised. The schools belong to the people and the people belong to the politicians; therefore, the complete divorcement of the schools from politics would seem to be well-nigh impossible in this country. The problem that confronts the schoolman then is, how to get the control of the purely educational department of school management as far away from the politician as possible. Obviously this can be done only by a centralization of authority in the superintendent of schools.[14]

D.T. Dr. Rice, as a pediatrician and journalist, you have been outspoken on school reform for some time now — and have scars to prove it. Do you accept complete centralization of control of city schools?

Dr. Joseph M. Rice. A superintendent cannot well care for more than one hundred and fifty, or at most two hundred teachers; in other words, he cannot properly care, without assistance, for a city of more than seventy-five thousand inhabitants at the utmost. As New York has twenty times two hundred teachers, twenty times seventy-five thousand inhabitants, its schools should be divided into at least twenty independent districts, each one of which should be placed in charge of a superintendent having all the powers and responsibilities of a city superintendent.[15]

D.T. How optimistic are you, Mr. Eliot, about changing the composition and procedures of city school boards? As President of Harvard and as a school reformer you have seen many educational movements come and go.

Charles W. Eliot. I want to point out that a few disinterested and active men may sometimes get good legislation out of an American legislature. It was an extraordinarily small group of men acting under a single leader that obtained from the Massachusetts legislature the act which established the Boston School Committee of five members. The name of that leader was James J. Storrow. I am happy to believe that the group were all Harvard men. I have been much interested during the last year in studying both municipal evils and the chances of municipal reform; and I find the greatest encouragement for the ultimate success of that cause in the fact that many school committees in American cities have been redeemed, and made efficient, far-seeing, and thoroughly trustworthy.[16]

D.T. Mr. Draper, you were one of the first to advocate changes in the governing of urban schools and were mainly responsible for an NEA statement of policy on that matter. Would you care to summarize the reforms you see as essential?

Andrew S. Draper. First. The affairs of the school should not be mixed up with partisan contests or municipal business. Second. There should be a sharp distinction between legislative functions and executive duties. Third. Legislative functions should be clearly fixed by statute and be exercised by a comparatively small board, each member of which is representative of the whole city. Fourth. Administration should be separated into two great independent departments, one of which manages the business interests and the other of which supervises the instruction. The chief executive of the department of instruction should be given a long term and may be appointed by the board. Once appointed he should be independent. He should appoint all authorized assistants and teachers. He should assign to duties and discontinue services for cause, at his discretion. He should determine all matters relating to instruction. The trouble has been that the boards were independent and the machine so ponderous and the prerogatives and responsibilities so confused that people could not get a hearing or could not secure redress, perhaps for the reason that no one official had the power to redress.[17]

The Process of Centralization

You have heard the views of these reformers. How successful were they? In 1894, when the movement to centralize control of city schools was just gaining momentum, Draper found little agreement among schoolmen on the specifics of urban school reform despite a general belief in smaller and less political school boards.[18] A generation later, a survey of 50 prominent city superintendents showed a remarkable degree of consensus on how urban schools should be run. The years from 1890 to 1910 had produced a set of values which became conventional educational wisdom. Of the 50 superintendents, 45 favored small school boards; 40 preferred election of boards from the city at large rather than by the older ward pattern; 46 thought it better to appoint rather than to elect superintendents; and 43 believed that superintendents were gaining the greater power and independence that befit their professional status.[19]

The watchwords of the reform movement in the city schools became centralization, expertise, professionalization, non-political control, efficiency. The most attractive models of organization were the large-scale industrial bureaucracies rapidly emerging in that age of consolidation. In city after city — Cleveland, New York, Boston, St. Louis, Baltimore, and others — leading business and professional men spearheaded the reforms. As Eliot reported, it was sometimes a very small group of patricians who secured new charters from state legislatures and thereby reorganized the urban schools without a popular vote in the cities. University presidents and leading school superintendents and education professors sometimes collaborated with the elite municipal reformers (Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia, for example, saw an analogy in function between university trustees and city school boards since both should delegate administration to professional officers and both should be composed of "the best people.")[20] A major forum for the new conceptions of centralized and professionalized urban education became the National Education Association.[21] Often small cities and towns emulated the bureaucratic structures pioneered in the large cities. Professionally-directed urban school surveys helped to spread the gospel of bureaucratic efficiency in the years after 1910. Superintendents of great school systems saw parallels between their work and that of captains of industry. They promoted close ties between school systems and the business community.[22] Underlying much of the reform movement was an elitist assumption that prosperous, native-born Protestant Anglo-Saxons were superior to other groups and thus should determine the curriculum and the allocation of jobs. It was the mission of the schools to imbue children of the immigrants and the poor with uniformly WASP ideals.[23]

As was the case with other progressive urban reforms, the program to centralize and professionalize the schools sometimes failed to win enough votes in the state legislature. Often teachers saw bureaucratization not as a welcome relief from "politicians" but as a new form of autocracy. In Baltimore, for example, large numbers of teachers sabotaged the reform administration of Superintendent Van Sickle.[24]

The debate over centralization in New York City in 1896 illustrated the forces opposing the reformers. In his perceptive study of this battle, David Hammack finds that "in addition to a majority of the School Commissioners, nearly all of the city's school Inspectors, Trustees, principals and teachers opposed centralization." The New York central board of education had been relatively weak. In each of the twenty-four local wards, five trustees of the schools hired teachers and supervised the schools within their jurisdiction. Opponents of centralization argued that these local trustees were valuable mediators between school and community:

> The varied character of our population, and the concentration of special classes of our people in certain districts, makes it desirable that these people be represented in school matters, and this will only be possible by the appointment of local officials with the necessary powers of actions, who are acquainted with the distinctive characteristics . . . of the several neighborhoods.[25]

The editor of *School* Magazine concurred, saying that the active interest of these local officials stimulated public support of the schools. In addition, as Hammack observes, "the local trustee system allowed for a flexible school policy, since diverse community groups could modify basic policies in accordance with
munity groups could modify basic policies in accordance with
local preferences, increasing public confidence in the schools and enabling the trustees to 'harmonize' intergroup conflicts at the local level." Teachers and laymen alike worried about what might happen should the superintendent become "a kind of educational Pooh-Bah."[26] Reflecting this concern the President of the New York Board of Education later forbade the Superintendent to attend meetings of the National Education Association, a central gathering place of the captains of education.[27]

Here and there were powerful school officials who also worried about the effects of centralization of urban schools. One of the pioneers of professional school administration, Burke A. Hinsdale, wrote that

> In all cities, and most of all in large ones, the tendency toward machinery and bureaucracy is very strong in all kinds of work. It is hard for the individual to assert his personal force. The superintendent's temptation to busy himself with manipulation is great. . . . These considerations impel me to the conclusion that in the large cities the superintendent will, as a rule, more and more tend to machinery and administration; that he will become even more an office man than he now is; that he will be less

> known in the form of educational thought than he is at present—which is certainly saying a great deal.[28]

Ella Flagg Young, who served as teacher, principal, and superintendent in the Chicago Schools, became concerned that teachers would feel powerless and isolated in the vast city systems.[29]

Urban school reform in the period from 1890 to 1910 clearly fits the pattern of elite municipal change described by the historian Samuel P. Hays. Probing beneath the surface rhetoric which pitted "the corrupt politician" v. "the good citizen," Hays finds that most of the prominent urban "progressives" were leaders in the financial and professional life of their cities. Their motives were more complicated than simple abhorrence of graft. They deplored the fact that under the decentralized ward system political power belonged mostly to lower- and middle-class groups (many of them first or second generation immigrants). They wished to apply to urban government the same process of centralization and bureaucratization, the same delegation of power to professional experts, as they had developed in their own businesses and associations. Reformers wanted, says Hays, "not simply to replace bad men with good; they proposed to change the occupational and class origins of decision-makers." When these innovators talked of selecting "the best people" as school board members, they, like many schoolmen, tended to disqualify the working class:

> Employment as ordinary laborer and in the lowest class of mill work would naturally lead to the conclusion that such men did not have sufficient education or business training to act as school directors. . . . Objection might also be made to small shopkeepers, clerks, workmen at many trades, who by lack of educational advantages and business training, could not, no matter how honest, be expected to administer properly the affairs of an educational system requiring special knowledge, and where millions are spent each year.[30]

Underlying the ideology of the "non-political" urban school board, then, was an actual realignment of power among economic classes.[31] Behind the doctrine of professional control of instruction, of the bureaucratization of schooling, was a profound shift of opinion about who should actually determine the goals and processes of education.[32] We live today with some of the unforeseen consequences of these reforms.

Will Public Education Survive in the Great Cities?

"Even a cursory glance at the current writing on the state of urban education makes it clear that the first question to ask is whether public schools will survive the next decade in the great cities."[33] This statement by George LaNoue of Teachers College, Columbia, would have sounded apocalyptic in 1960. When he published it, in March, 1968, after riots in the streets and the dismal story told by the Kerner Commission, it sounded pessimistic, but plausible. By the summer of 1969, after the disastrous teachers' strike in New York and turmoil in city schools almost everywhere, the question has new urgency. In any case, urban public education *as we know it today* seems destined to change.[34] How it will change will depend in no small measure on the responses of city school boards.

The achievements of the generation of school reformers at the turn of the century have become the targets of critics today. Centralization of control of schools has produced vast bureaucracies whose red tape and resistance to change have been satirized by Bel Kaufm Daniel V. Levine, Marilyn Gittell, and David Rogers. Policy-making often has seemed a closed system in which school boards, ostensibly a-political and relying on professionals, simply legitimize the recommendations of the school staff. Board members are often unable to acquire information on which to base independent decisions.[35] The "merit system" has also become a target. Elaborate credential and examination requirements, originally designed to frustrate the spoils system, now seem to exclude members of minority groups who make up an ever-increasing proportion of the population of central cities. They also prevent school boards from employing experts who do not possess proper certificates. In recent years teachers' organizations have also fought changes in the seniority and personnel systems. Unable to make new policies through established channels, disaffected citizens have increasingly pressured the system from outside.[36] In growing numbers the clients—students and their parents—have lost faith in the professionals.

By no means has all criticism come from outside the ranks of schoolmen. Hear Mark R. Shedd, superintendent of the Philadelphia Schools, on the subject of decentralization:

Urban bureaucracies have tended generally to codify and enforce systemic values which divert attention from the presumed focus of education—the classroom. Symbolically, children and teachers rarely appear on the tables of organization. Centrally dictated curriculum and personnel assignments; central office monopoly on status positions; centrally formulated rules and procedures, which gain the force of moral dicta; these are the identifying marks of large school systems . . . those at the bottom of the bureaucratic pyramid—principals and teachers—become clerks. And children, who bear the total weight of the structure, are not so much educated as processed. Ironically, as one principal put it, "We'd have a great school system if it weren't for the kids." . . . One inevitable conclusion is that the bureaucracies of big city schools must either transform themselves or be dismantled by assault from the outside. This means decentralization. . . .[37]

Former U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, II, called for a system of checks and balances between laymen and schoolmen, asserting that "left unchecked, the professional is liable to become a dictator; a school superintendent is no more exempt from becoming a hometown Hitler than the most pompous and arrogant Babbit who ever headed a school board." He also said that "we should . . . get rid of some of the prickly requirements for school system employment so that we can have the advantage of special talents that we are now denied."[38]

A Crisis of Authority

At the base of the current conflicts lies a crisis of authority which will probably lead to a restructuring of the control of urban public education. Joe L. Rempson, who has worked with local school boards in Harlem, has argued that "the crucial point is that *the community has the right to elect the members of the local school board.* Having become so accustomed to the status quo, some forget that local control of education is a fundamental right . . . people in a democracy have a right to have a voice in that which importantly affects their life."[39] At a meeting of professionals and Harlem residents, Queen Mother Moore expressed the deep sense of alienation felt by many black people: "Now, this is *your* system! . . . I was sorry not to stand up when you sang the Star Spangled Banner. It has no meaning for me, but *you'd* never understand this. It *has* no meaning for me!"[40]

Whence comes this crisis of authority? In large part it stems from three inter-related, and sometimes conflicting, forces: the quests for black power, teacher power, and student power. A decade ago few observers predicted how important these movements would become in the politics of educational decision-making.[41] Today city boards and superintendents can ignore them only at their peril, although of the three groups, only teachers have as yet attained much real power. The demographic revolution since 1940—displacing whites in the inner city with black and Puerto Rican migrants, accelerating the flight to the suburbs of middle-class whites and business and industry—has profoundly altered the traditional relationship of urban schools to their environments. Today, most of the largest cities have school populations which are 40 per cent or more non-white. Blacks are becoming determined to achieve power in a white-dominated system.[42] At the same time, teachers have shown a new militance in strikes and collective bargaining over issues which go well beyond the traditional matters of salaries and fringe benefits. In some cities, as former superintendent Sidney Marland of Pittsburg has observed, "teachers demand control of all aspects of school policy." This has sometimes brought them into collision with militant blacks, as in New York.[43] And increasingly evident is a student power movement—demonstrated this past year in the Chicago boycotts, unrest in Los Angeles, and the student march on the Philadelphia Board of Education—which in some ways poses the sharpest threat to authority since it is a rebellion of those at the bottom of the educational pyramid.[44]

No doubt there is a mixture of hooliganism, blind self-interest, and mindless militance in some of these protests. If that were all there were to this crisis of authority, one might easily justify a policy of repression and maintenance of the status quo (though that might radicalize the moderates). Indeed, there is already evidence of a backlash of groups that have traditionally influenced the schools. But deeper ideological and practical issues underlie the surface protest. The fact is that urban schools today belie the historic ideals of the American common school, which was to be free, under close public control, inclusive of all social groups, of such high quality that parents would want no other, and offering real equality of opportunity to all children. The ghetto parent can clearly see that his child's school is segregated; that he has little voice in important school policies; and that the graduates of ghetto schools are woefully ill-prepared.[45] Poor schooling might have been unfortunate for the immigrant child in 1900, but not disastrous. Today, the second industrial revolution has destroyed millions of blue-collar jobs, and our society often requires educational credentials for entry into even low-level white-collar positions.[46] Blacks now speak feelingly of "educational genocide," of schooling which not only fails to prepare children to succeed in white society but also denies the validity of Afro-American experience.[47]

Muckraking journalism helped to produce the urban school reforms at the turn of the century, as writers exposed the machinations of school politicians. Today a literature of exposure and protest, coupled with studies by social scientists, is fueling the current reform movement. Only recently have school districts released to the public the bad news on the academic achievement of children in ghetto schools. National studies like the Coleman Report and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission study have corroborated that black children regularly fall behind the national norms farther and farther the longer they remain in school.[48] The titles of two popular books on city schools—*Our Children Are Dying* and *Death at an Early Age*—drive home the writers' conclusions.[49] Whether in 1892 in Joseph Rice's articles or in 1967 in Jonathan Kozol's book, muckraking may not be balanced and judicious, but it powerfully undermines faith in the schools.

Responses to the Crisis

How might urban school boards and schoolmen respond to these upheavals? Like musk oxen in closed ranks with horns lowered, they might repel the attackers. This makes sense only if the current order is best. I would maintain that centralized, professionalized bureaucracies no longer fit the needs of urban society, if indeed they ever did, and that we need massive structural changes in city schools to make them responsive to the people they serve. This does not imply that school board members should give up under fire and abandon their principles, but rather that they should re-examine their principles to see if they still fit. Like Huck Finn, who disregarded his "yellow dog conscience" about slavery to help Jim escape, we need to respond to human needs as we understand them in our time.

In most cities there is still time for planned rather than cataclysmic change. Plans should be as diverse as our pluralistic metropolitan society. I need not remind you that what would be appropriate for Denver might well be wrong for Detroit. Contrary to some Manhattan dwellers, American urban life is not New York writ small. But there are some features of reform which might be generalized:

(1) In most large cities integration has ceased to be a major goal of civil rights activists. Despite persistent agitation, they have seen segregation increase. Growing percentages of blacks in restricted ghettos, lethargy of boards and schoolmen in carrying out desegregation, and hostility of whites have often made their efforts futile. Yet in my opinion, it would be poor social policy to abandon the goal of integration. It may be impossible today to desegregate schools in most large cities, at least without crossing city boundaries, but in many small and medium sized cities integration is still possible and desirable. It is just as important for whites as for blacks to learn first-hand how to live together peaceably in a multiracial society.[50]

(2) Despite high hopes, compensatory education has produced disappointing results in practice. It is true that many compensatory projects have been funded too sparsely and too briefly for a definitive test. But rapidly accumulating evidence suggests that simply giving pupils an intensified or remedial version of the standard curriculum while retaining the same bureaucratic structure is not likely to break the cycle of failure in urban education for the children who need it most. Often such projects have in effect compensated teachers or added new administrative positions without producing observable gains for the students.[51]

(3) I believe the basic need in urban education today is schools which are more responsive and responsible to the populations they serve—and this implies some form of decentralization of control. Social scientists are documenting the common sense notion that if parents and students have a sense of control over their own destinies, and if teachers have high expectations of pupils and are held accountable for results, marked gains in achievement of "disadvantaged" students are possible.[52] The

National Academy of Education has observed that "school districts with a pupil population larger than 150,000 are prone to bureaucratic rigidities and impersonalities, and are likely to produce an unhealthy tension between concerned parents on the one hand and top school officials and board members on the other."[53] As we have seen, a major purpose of bureaucratization was originally to fix responsibility, yet legion are the stories of buck-passing and "that's not my department." Centralized control was supposed to give power to the superintendent to adapt the schools to new conditions, yet in large systems he can often be sabotaged and rendered ineffective by subordinates (indeed, some say that real power in many big cities is not bureaucratic but baronial—each assistant superintendent or section head mutually bound by ties of feudal loyalty to his followers).[54]

Today a tide is turning against centralized solutions to organizational and social problems. Many large business concerns have decentralized and have found delegated responsibility to be efficient. Liberal reformers no longer turn automatically to Washington to solve intractable problems with yet another bureau.[55] And many classical liberals still agree with Toulmin Smith, who wrote in 1851 that "centralization is that system of government under which the smallest number of minds, and those knowing the least, and having the smallest opportunities of knowing it, about the special matter in hand, and having the smallest interest in its well-working, have the management of it, or control over it."[56] The hitch, of course, is that it is most prominently black people who are calling for community control in the central cities. This is hard for a society tainted by centuries of racism to accept, and difficult to get rural-dominated state legislatures to enact into law. But the time has come when the underclasses of the great cities will take matters illegally into their own hands unless those in control find ways to restructure urban schools so that residents may have more voice in the education of their children.

There are dangers in such decentralization, of course. It might fragment the political base education needs. It will doubtless threaten teachers and administrators who have long been insulated from the community by bureaucratic buffers (in Chicago, for example, telephone numbers of elementary schools formerly were not listed in the telephone book). It might increase parochialism and racial and economic segregation. Local control might make teachers easy prey for extremists of all stripes. Decentralization might increase provincialism and bigotry. But controls can be built into a system of community control to deter unwarranted interference with teachers' rights while increasing professional accountability and responsiveness. Also today the mass media and other unifying influences of a corporate society push toward conformity, and it may be time to encourage in our schools a vigorous pluralism and sense of local community. The crucial goal today is to create an open society, not a uniform society.[57]

(4) There are many possible models of "decentralization," each with its own assets and liabilities. The New York experience of ambiguous delegation of responsibility to "demonstration districts" hardly seems one to emulate. It did not build on existing strong community organizations and produced bitter conflict between the staff of the "demonstration districts" and the professional organizations, notably the teachers' union.[58]

The Woodlawn Developmenal Project, a collaboration of the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization (a black action association), and the University of Chicago, seems to be a better route to decentralization, resting as it does on agreements hammered out in advance by a strong community group and its partners (although there are few results shown as yet). The President of The Woodlawn Organization made it clear that what his group was seeking was influence and consultation, not total control: "I don't feel the Woodlawn Community Board should have the final authority and responsibility for running the schools . . . but isn't there some way to make sure that the Director of the Experimental District must deal with the Woodlawn Community Board prior to bringing matters to the General Superintendent or to the Board of Education . . . to seek its concurrence . . . ?[59]

Under the leadership of Mark Shedd the Philadelphia Schools have involved parents and students in designing a citywide Afro-American history curriculum, in changing the vocational program, and in a variety of other ways. In addition, like other cities, Philadelphia has attempted administrative decentralization by granting principals and teachers more autonomy to adapt instruction to the pupils. "A basic goal . . . is to make the central office a service agency, instead of a controlling agency . . ." The central staff emulates a foundation in giving grants to individual teachers and schools for innovative projects. Indeed, as Elliott Shapiro demonstrated in Harlem, one way in which a school principal can become effective in the ghetto is by allying as a maverick bureaucrat with the people he serves rather than with his superiors. If schools reward this sort of behavior, it will go far to make education more decentralized and relevant.[60]

(5) An essential part of a successful plan of decentralized schools is the indigenous development of community leaders. Nineteenth-century advocates of the ward system of school control argued that local trustees knew their people, stimulated public interest in education, and resolved local conflicts, but such political sub-structures have often become ineffectual and fragmented in the twentieth century. Accordingly, new political-educational leadership may need to be shaped deliberately. Joe L. Rempson has sketched one such program which promises to educate both community and school board members through the process of election and policy making. He explodes the easy alibi of parents that their children don't learn because of negative attitudes of teachers, and of teachers that students don't learn because parents are irresponsible. Both share responsibility, he says: "While I do believe that the chief source of the motivation to learn is usually the home, there is no question that . . . the school can—and often does—kill the motivation that the child does bring from home. . . ." Elections should be well publicized and should educate the community about the goals, problems, and achievements of the schools:

> The candidates would not just announce that they would be at certain places and then wait for everyone to show up. Quite literally, the candidates would instead go to the people. An effort should be made to reach the people through every available and conceivable method: house-to-house contact, street corner forums, closed-circuit television, printed bulletins, and automobile loudspeakers.

Because of the importance of this campaign in informing and involving the people, the campaign expenses should be subsidized by the central board, Rempson believes, and consultants available on request to help candidates refine and express their views. Candidates and elected representatives would also attend training workshops to learn more about the operation of schools. The purpose would be not only to create a more sophisticated and effective leadership in the ghetto but also to encourage the residents to regard the school system as *we*, not *they*.[61]

(6) The revival of interest in a genuine community school promises to recreate education on a more human scale. What really counts in the daily lives of people is their daily lives—what they see and hear and think and do. Too often residents have regarded the ghetto school as an outpost of a foreign power, a place where the child and his parents are subjects, not citizens. To alter this relationship is a goal of many people today—some of them, like Charles Hamilton, black power exponents—who desire to change the school into a community center. They argue that many services for people of all ages could be located there: legal aid, health and recreation programs, welfare offices, and employment bureaus and training centers.[62] To rebuild schools on a human scale would require changes not only in how schools are run but also in how they are constructed. It is hard for parents not to feel like intruders when they go to see the principal if they are forced to wait in an austere and busy outer office, sitting on a hard bench next to children waiting to be disciplined. Consider how different would be their experience if each school had a parents' room with carpet and comfortable chairs, where they might drink coffee and talk with the principal or teachers informally. And why should not a school cafeteria be a place where parents as well as children eat?

(7) Obviously the sorts of changes I have been suggesting would cost a great deal of money, even if many presently fragmented social services were to contribute to the budgets of the community school. It is obvious that the funds available now are grotesquely inadequate. Christopher Jencks observed in 1967 that "the schools" performance is evaluated not so much in terms of long-term results as in terms of short-term costs. The result is underlined by contrasting the education programs of the city of Philadelphia and the U.S. Armed Forces. At any one time, both are educating between 250,000 and 300,000 students.

For this, Philadelphia spends about $100 million a year, while the Armed Forces spend $3 billion—or $400 per pupil compared to $10,000.)"[63] As H. Thomas James has said, "local taxpaying ability is the most important determinant of social policy in education for American cities. Until we find the means to reverse that equation, and let social policy determine the resources to be allocated to education, we face a rising sea of troubles in our cities."[64] Finding these funds is a matter of the utmost importance for central and community school boards and for officials at all levels of government.

The Future Role of Central School Boards

Even if the actual operation of schools should become decentralized, I believe that central school boards will continue into the next decade in large cities and that their job will become increasingly conflict-ridden—that is, politicized. George LaNoue maintains that mayors will increasingly be held responsible for the welfare of public education: "it is clear that education cannot be treated separately from problems of housing, welfare and unemployment. Any political leader who wants to save or even to improve his city is going to have to make public education a priority matter."[65] Whatever the degree of political involvement of the mayor, whatever the amount of decentralization, school board members will need to develop great skill at resolving and mediating conflicts. Freed of the myth that education can be "non-political," they should seek new institutions of accommodation, such as ombudsmen, new means of due process at a time when normal professional channels will be under attack. They will need new sources of information about the schools, and sophistication about the social context within which schooling takes place. A healthy scepticism about the relative importance of schooling in the total education of a child will broaden the scope of their responsibility. For instance, much current research points to the crucial influence of the family on the educational achievement of the child. Thus school board members might protest the educational consequences of taking welfare mothers away from their children while training them for jobs.[66]

But whatever new channels of accommodation they develop, or new roles they acquire, an important measure of urban school board members will still be their personal qualities. And essential in their qualifications, in my view, is an ability to understand the point of view of the boy in Harlem who identified with the worm, not the early bird. Beyond the quarrels of adults, children must still be the central concern. They were for Horace Mann, who declared: "let the next generation be my client."[67]

NOTES

[1] Jodie Foote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Myrtle, Mississippi, December 22, 1936, in Alfred D. Smith collection of W.P.A. papers, Moorland Collection, Howard University Library.

[2] Daniel P. Moynihan has said, "Given the mounting extremism of American politics, to fail to deliver on the promises made to Negro Americans in the first half of this decade would be to trifle with the stability of the American republic." *Harvard Today*, (Autumn, 1967), 19.

[3] Very little historical work has been done on the development of bureaucratic norms. Two beginnings are Michael Katz, "The Emergence of Bureaucracy in Urban Education: The Boston Case," *History of Education Quarterly*, VIII (Summer, 1968), 155-88; and VIII (Fall, 1968), 319-357; and David Tyack, "Bureaucracy and the Common School: The Example of Portland, Oregon, 1851-1913," *American Quarterly*, XIX (Fall, 1967), 475-98.

[4] To make the text more readable in this interview format I have omitted quotation marks and have occasionally condensed the authors' remarks (without, of course, changing the order or the sense).

[5] L. H. Jones, "The Politician and the Public School, Indianapolis and Cleveland," *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXVII (June, 1896), 810.

[6] Jones, "Politician," 814-15.

[7] S. A. Wetmore, "Boston School Administration," *Educational Review*, XIV (September, 1897), 112.

[8] Ellwood P. Cubberley, "The School Situation in San Francisco," *Educational Review*, XXI (April, 1901), 368.

[9] Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Changing Conceptions of Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909), 15; see also Cubberley, *Public School Administration* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922).

[10] Andrew S. Draper, "Plans of Organization for School Purposes in Large Cities," National Education Association, *Addresses and Proceedings*, XXVIII (December, 1904), 438.

[11] George A. O. Ernst, "The Movement for School Reform in Boston," *Educational Review*, XXVIII (December, 1904), 438.

[12] James C. Boykin "Organization of City School Boards," *Educational Review*, XIII (March, 1897), 233-34.

[13] Ernst, "School Reform," 433-44.

[14] Truman A. Deweese, "Better School Administration," *Educational Review*, XX (June, 1900), 62.

[15] Joseph M. Rice, *The Public School System of the United States* (New York: The Century Company, 1893), 50.

[16] Charles W. Eliot, "Educational Reform and the Social Order," *The School Review*, XVII (April, 1909), 220.

[17] Andrew S. Draper, "Educational Organization and Administration," in Nicholas M. Butler, ed., *Education in the United States* (Albany, N.Y.: J. B. Lyon Company, 1900), 14-17.

[18] Draper, "Plan of Organization," 302.

[19] Arthur H. Chamberlain, "The Growth and Power of the City School Superintendent," University of California *Publications*, III (May 15, 1913), 398-412; see also the consensus expressed by Theodore L. Reller, *The Development of the City Superintendent of Schools in the United States* (Philadelphia: Published by the Author, 1935).

[20] Correspondence between Nicholas M. Butler and Mayor William Gaynor of New York, *Educational Review*, XLII (September, 1911), 204-10; Edward C. Eliot, "A Non-partisan School Law," National Education Association, *Addresses and Proceedings*, XLIV (1905), 223-31; William T. Harris, "City School Supervision, V," *Educational Review*, III (February, 1892), 167-72.

[21] Chamberlain, "City School Superintendent," 394.

[22] Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[23] David C. Hammack, "The Centralization of New York's Public School System, 1896: A Social Analysis of a Decision," unpublished M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1969, ch. 1; Sol Cohen, *Progressives and Urban School Reform: The Public Education Association of New York City 1895-1954* (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964), ch. 1; David Tyack, *Turning Points in American Educational History* (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967), parts 7, 9.

[24] George D. Strayer, "The Baltimore School Situation," *Educational Review*, XLII (November, 1911), 329-35.

[25] Hammack, "Centralization," 114.

[26] Hammack, "Centralization," 115, 117, 121.

[27] W. S. Sutton, "The School Board as a Factor in Educational Efficiency," *Educational Review*, XLIX (March, 1915), 261.

[28] Burke A. Hinsdale, "The American School Superintendent," *Educational Review*, VII (January, 1894), 50-51.

[29] Ella Flagg Young, *Isolation in the Schools* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906). The superintendent of schools in Rochester, New York, spoke at the N.E.A. about "cities in which supervisors go about from schoolroom to schoolroom, notebook and pencil in hand, sitting for a while in each room like malignant sphinxes, eyeing the terrified teacher, who in her terror does everything wrong, and then marking her in that little doomsday book"—Charles B. Gilbert, "The Freedom of the Teacher," National Education Association, *Proceedings and Addresses*, XLIII (1903), 167.

[30] Samuel P. Hays, "The Politics of Reform in Municipal Government in the Progressive Era," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, LV (October, 1964), 163.

[31] In addition to the Hays and Hammack studies cited, which give precise information on this shift of social and economic status of political influentials, another useful source is the unpublished essay of Elinor M. Gersman, "Progressive Reform of the St. Louis School Board, 1897" (portions of which will appear in her forthcoming doctoral dissertation at Washington University, St. Louis).

[32] A useful general study of changing structures is Joseph M. Cronin, "The Board of Education in the 'Great Cities,' 1890-1964," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1965.

[33] George R. LaNoue, "Political Questions in the Next Decade of Urban Education," *The Record*, LXIX (May, 1968), 517.

[34] Marilyn Gittell, "Urban School Reform in the 1970's," *Education and Urban Society*, I (November, 1968), 9-20.

[35] Daniel U. Levine, "Organizing for Reform in Big City Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLVIII (March, 1967), 311-315; Joseph Pois, *The School Board Crisis: A Chicago Case Study* (Chicago: Educational Methods, 1964); Marilyn Gittell, *Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City* (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1967); David Rogers, *110 Livingston Street* (New York: Random House, 1968); Norman D. Kerr, "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation," *Sociology of Education*, XXXVIII (Fall, 1964), 34-59.

[36] Marilyn Gittell and T. Edward Hollander, *Six Urban School Districts: A Comparative Study of Institutional Response* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1968).

[37] Mark R. Shedd, "Decentralization and Urban Schools," *Educational Leadership*, XXV (October, 1967), 32-33.

[38] Harold Howe II, "Should Educators Or Boards Control Our Public Schools?" *Nation's Schools*, VII (December, 1966), 31-32.

[39] Joe L. Rempson, "Community Control of Local School Boards," *Teachers College Record*, LXVIII (April, 1967), 573; Arthur E. Salz points out some inherent conflicts in "Local Control v. Professionalism," *Phi Delta Kappan*, L (February, 1969), 332-34.

[40] Queen Mother Moore, "A Band-Aid for a Cancer," Harvard Graduate School of Education Association, *Bulletin*, XII (Fall, 1967).

[41] See Carl F. Hansen, "When Courts Try to Run the Public Schools," *U. S. News and World Report*, April 21, 1969, 94-96.

[42] LaNoue, "Political Questions," 517-18.

[43] Donald W. Robinson, "Superintendent Marland of the Pittsburgh Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLIX (June, 1968), 562. This issue of the *Kappan* contains other articles on teacher militance.

[44] Daniel U. Levine, "Black Power: Implications for the Urban Educator," *Education and Urban Society*, I (February, 1969), 150-53; Mark R. Shedd and S. L. Halleck, "Hypothesis of Student Unrest," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XL (September, 1968), 2-8.

[45] Peter Schrag, "Why Our Schools Have Failed," *Commentary*, XLV (March, 1968), 31-38; Paul Lauter and Florence Howe, "The School Mess," *New York Review of Books*, February 1, 1968, 16-21.

[46] Ivar Berg, "Rich Men's Qualifications for Poor Men's Jobs," *IRCD Bulletin*, V (March, 1969), 1, 9-12.

[47] Kenneth Clark, *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1967), ch. 6; Alvin Poussaint, "Education and Black Self-Image," *Freedomways*, VIII (Fall, 1968), 334-339.

[48] James S. Coleman *et al.*, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966); U. S. Civil Rights Commission, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967); for expert, but differing, interpretations of the meanings of these massive studies, see the special issue of the *Harvard Educational Review* XXXVIII (Winter, 1968), on "Equal Opportunity."

[49] Nat Hentoff, *Our Children Are Dying* (New York: The Viking Press, 1966); Jonathan Kozol, *Death at an Early Age* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968); Edgar Z. Fridenberg, "Requiem for the Urban School," *Saturday Review*, November 18, 1967, 77-79, 92-94. The *Saturday Review* has also published several critical journalistic accounts of urban school systems. For a critical look at the critics, see Robert Havighurst, "Requirements for a Valid 'New Criticism,'" *Phi Delta Kappan*, XL (September, 1968), 20-26.

[50] Thomas Pettigrew, "School Integration in Current Perspective," *The Urban Review*, III (January, 1969), 4-8; Robert Crain and David Street, "School Desegregation and School Decision-Making," *Urban Affairs Quar-*

terly, II (September, 1967), 64-82; Robert Dentler *et al*, *The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1967).

[51] For a critical review of the assumptions underlying much compensatory education, see Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Blame the Negro Child" and Edward K. Weaver, "The New Literature on the Education of the Black Child," in *Freedomways*, VIII (Fall, 1968), 340-46, 367-76.

[52] Wilkerson, "Blame the Negro Child," 343-46; Clark, *Dark Ghetto*, ch. 6; Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobsen, *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1968). The last study has been both praised and severely faulted by reviewers.

[53] National Academy of Education, *Policy Making for American Public Schools* (n.p.: National Academy of Education, 1969), 7-8; Roald Campbell, "Is the School Superintendent Obsolete?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLVIII (October, 1966), 50-58, deals with new demands on school administrators.

[54] Gittell, *Participants*, 7-10.

[55] It is instructive to note how few of the reformers who wrote essays for the brilliant collection *The Schoolhouse in the City* (Alvin Toffler, ed., New York: Frederick Praeger, 1968) advocated turning to the national or state governments for solutions to local problems in education.

[56] Toulmin Smith, *Local Self-Government and Centralization* (London: J. Chapman, 1851), 12.

[57] Marilyn Gittell and Alan Halvesi, eds., *The Politics of Urban Education* (New York: Frederick Praeger, 1969), part V.

[58] Martin Mayer, *The Teacher's Strike New York, 1968* (New York: Perennial Library, 1969); Gittell and Halvesi, *Politics*, 261-377.

[59] Willard J. Congreve, "Collaborating for Urban Education in Chicago: The Woodlawn Developmental Project," *Education and Urban Society*, I (February, 1969), 177-192, 186.

[60] Mark R. Shedd, "Recreating the City Schools," Harvard Graduate School of Education Association, *Bulletin*, XII (Spring, 1969), 2-6; Wallace Roberts, "Can Urban Schools Be Reformed?" *Saturday Review*, May 17, 1969, 70-72, 87-91; Henry S. Resnik, "The Shedd Revolution—A Philadelphia Story," *The Urban Review*, III (January, 1969), 20-26; Hentoff, *Our Children*.

[61] Rempson, "Community Control," 572-75; Dentler, *Urban R's*, part 3.

[62] Charles Hamilton, "Education in the Black Community: An Examination of the Realities," *Freedomways*, VIII (Fall, 1968), 319-24. One of the most successful earlier practitioners of the community school idea, Leonard Covello, has a fascinating interview in *The Urban Review*, III (January, 1969), 13-19. See also Mario Fantini and Gerald Weinstein, *Making Urban Schools Work: Social Realities and the Urban School* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), 52-61.

[63] Christopher Jencks, "Private Management for Public Schools," *Education Memorandum #4*, October 26, 1965, *Institute for Policy Studies*, Washington, D.C., 2.

[64] H. Thomas James *et al.*, *Determinants of Educational Expenditures in Large Cities of the United States* (Cooperative Research Project No. 2389, Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, 1966), 17.

[65] LaNoue, "Political Questions," 527; Robert H. Salisbury, "Schools and Politics in the Big City," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXVII (Summer, 1967), 408-424; Bernard Mackler and Nancy Bord, "The Role of the Urban Mayor in Education," *The Record*, LXIX (March, 1968), 531-542.

[66] H. Thomas James, "School Board Conflict Is Inevitable," *The American School Board Journal*, CLIV (March, 1967), 5-9.

[67] Stephen Joseph, ed., *The Me Nobody Knows* (New York: Avon Books, 1969), 113; Peter Binzen, "How to Pick a School Board," *Saturday Review*, April 17, 1965, 72-73, 83-84.

3. School Boards: Functional and Fiscal Relationships

H. Thomas James

Several years ago the Carnegie Corporation provided me with funds to study school boards. The major portion of these funds were expended in support of advanced graduate students working with me on these studies. Thus, in addition to the insights we gained about school boards, the effort produced a useful byproduct of young men interested in school board structures and functions, who were trained in disciplined methods of inquiry, and who have continued to study in this field. We can expect further useful studies on this subject to emerge from the work of these men, among whom were Joe Cronin, now at Harvard; Jim Kelly at Teachers College, Columbia; Jay Scribner at UCLA; and Jim Guthrie at the University of California at Berkeley.

Our inquiries were probably more divergent than is generally true of project-type inquiries, in part because my style of inquiry tends toward the divergent, and in part because this style leads me to pick my associates on such criteria as high intelligence, lively interest, independence, and initiative; and to give them broad freedom to define their interests and pursue them independently. The only common constraint I insist on is that each one develop a disciplined way of knowing and method of inquiry, though what the discipline is I leave to the student. Thus, Cronin used an historical method in his study of the development of boards of education in the large cities;[1] Scribner used a political science approach to analyze a single board's operations over one year;[2] Kelly also used a political science concept and methodology to study conflict resolution in relation to school board recall elections;[3] and Guthrie used sociological concepts and methods of inquiry in a case study of school-community conflict not yet published.

Our preliminary efforts gave us little satisfaction, for as is often the case in the beginning of a large study, initial questions turn out to be poorly formulated, and therefore efforts to answer them are frustrating and often inconclusive. I was interested in the processes by which school boards are selected, for I thought therein might lie some clues to school board performance.

Earlier studies of school board structure, notably by Counts[4] and the National Education Association,[5] reveal that as districts increase in size, the selection of school boards shifts from town meeting processes to general elections, from general elections to elections by wards, and from elective processes to appointment of board members as the dominant procedure in very large districts. Though it went unremarked in both the Counts and the NEA studies, I was impressed with a trend that appeared to me to be general, and that is the tendency, as appointment processes are accepted, to clear appointments through voluntary associations. So I began these studies with the general hypothesis that changes in the procedures for selection of school board members are symptomatic of the increasing difficulty experienced by a school district in identifying leadership as the population of the district increases, and that when a district does not depend on political parties to identify its leadership for public education, then that district comes to depend increasingly on the voluntary associations for this service.

Since the office of school board member is a minor office in the hierarchy of political power and influence, to the degree that political parties are active in staffing the office, it will be perceived by the public as of low status. On the other hand, if we postulate a status hierarchy for the voluntary associations, then to the degree that the selection processes are influenced by higher status associations, the public will perceive the school board member as occupying a higher status office in his community.

We began our investigation by assembling the detailed information necessary to describe the process of school board selection in greater detail than has heretofore been done. First, we analyzed the statutory provisions for selection in the 50 states; second, we searched out and described those charter provisions that establish deviant procedures in many of the states, especially in the larger cities; and third, we visited carefully selected districts, and began the systematic study of the informal arrangements that have grown up by custom and practice to augment the selection procedures specified by statutes and by city charters. We found these extra-legal arrangements highly personalized in the small districts, with a struggle evident to maintain the face-to-face relationships as the districts became larger, through informal caucus-type arrangements, and through nominating and primary eliminations preceding elections; then in the very large districts, the shift to appointments by political officers, with such appointments finally coming under some measure of scrutiny or control by voluntary associations.

I began with an assumption, which I made quite explicit in the beginning to my colleagues and to the Carnegie Corporation, that alternative arrangements for the structuring of boards have important consequences that are revealed in their operations, especially in those involving fiscal decisions. For this reason I drew on some previous work I had done under contract with the U.S. Office of Education in which I had experimented with a method for predicting expenditures of a school district with an effective probability slightly above 75 percent on the basis of (1) its ability to pay taxes, and (2) its demand for educational services. To develop a sample set of districts to begin our school board studies, I selected from each of the ten states studied under the U.S.O.E. grant a set of districts that exceeded our predicted expenditures, and a second set that fell below predictions. I included in each state's set, wherever possible, a core city, an industrial suburb, residential suburbs of different ages, and an independent city without suburbs. From personal interviews conducted by members of my staff with informed citizens in each community we obtained sufficient information to construct for the more influential voluntary associations an approximate order as to status, and to gain a general estimate of their influence in school board selections. We then compared the structural arrangements (both legal and informal) between sets in each state, in the expectation that there would be discernible differences. I had hoped to gain some valuable insights into how school board operations are affected by structural arrangements, why these arrangements are so stable, and perhaps some useful suggestions as to what can be done to speed changes when the need for change is indicated.

The Superintendent's Influence

We wanted to know why, with ability and demand held constant, some districts differed markedly in the amount spent for education, and we found, as one might expect, that there are important differences in the leadership styles of superintendents systematically related to these differences in expenditure levels. The superintendents who usually were found in the high expenditure districts were "live wires," "young men on their way up," men who always pushed their budgeting requests to the limit, counting on arousing public enthusiasm to carry the requests through. Conversely, more often in the low expenditure districts the superintendent was an older man hoping to hang on until retirement, who often had been appointed from within the system, who "played it safe," who recommended "not rocking the boat," and whose budget requests were always less than he was sure he could pass, thus maintaining a wide margin against defeat. On closer study over time, we found in the high set a high rate of turnover of superintendents, for as the young men on the way up moved up, the board usually hired another young man on the way up; and the low set usually replaced the "old man" with another much like him. Thus we found ourselves again dealing with yet another facet or manifestation of the expectations in the community that defined not only the role of the superintendent, but shaped the board's selection of the incumbent as well. This reinforced our interest in the line of inquiry that would permit us to explore the part played by the voluntary associations in making explicit the expectations of sub-publics of the school district's population.

Not all of the deviant districts were deviant because of leadership behavior, however; some were deviant because of peculiarities in the form of their wealth and the unusual situation this form created under the rules of the game applying to them. For example, a district with an unusually large proportion of the tax base in property owned by a public utility provides a special case in states allowing local boards to tax such property, for boards have little difficulty persuading residents to submit to higher tax rates when they can show what great benefits they can vote for themselves out of the utility taxes at the higher rates. One might expect the utility to protest, but since local taxes are a part of the base of costs on which the government-controlled profits of a public utility are computed, the higher taxes actually increase the profits of the company. Similarly, boards of education in resort communities where much of the property belongs to absentees find it easier to keep taxes high by showing the benefits accruing to the community from taxing the property of summer residents, who aren't around to guard their property during budget-making and taxing seasons, or cast votes against the board at election time. With a little help from the local assessor, who sometimes tends to keep resident voters' property values low and absentee owned property values high, milking the absentee property owners can become quite profitable for the district.

As we pressed our inquiries into selection processes further, and extended them eventually into 45 school districts in ten states, we began to feel the sense of frustration I referred to earlier, for though we found plenty of evidence to support the notion that voluntary associations do indeed function as training schools for civic leadership, plenty of illustrations of how they perform their quiet work as informal evaluators of citizen talent for leadership and nominators of candidates for leaderships roles in civic and governmental affairs, we could not establish that the form of these structural arrangements among the voluntary associations and in relation to school board selection made any difference, for over time we found good and bad performance related to all the structural arrangements for selection. Eventually we came to the conclusion that any structural arrangement for selection could work well if the citizens of the district were actively interested and concerned, and that any form could be corrupted in the presence of apathetic citizens.

We thought perhaps we were overlooking some key factor, and so reviewed the characteristics of board members. Some boards were composed almost exclusively of parents, who, when their children graduated, left the board as a matter of course. Other board members were drawn not from parent-child service groups (such as scouts or PTA) but from civic federations, business associations, ethnic or religious groups, or labor unions. Some boards included older civic leaders whose children had graduated, others included potential political figures whose children were not yet of school age.

Typology of Board Members

We began to classify the boards we saw, according to what seemed to be the major orientation of the board membership. We developed a typology of board members which includes:

(1) The Clients — those members whose children are served by the school system, invariably the "parent members."

(2) The Guardians — those members who own property, who try to keep controversy at a minimum, who primarily protect the public trust.

(3) The Benefactors — those members concerned with the improvement of staff benefits, the working conditions of all or a group of school system employees.

(4) The Politicos — those who intend to run for other public offices and who either intend to use this current post as a stepping-stone or have been assigned this role by party leaders.

(5) The Mavericks — those members who run with some specific reform or grievance in mind, whose allegiance is tied to some idea or ideal rather than to a group or to personal goals.

We concluded that about 60 percent of all members would be either "clients" or "guardians" and that most boards would include some of each. Moreover, we noted that the guardians tended to out-number the clients in low expenditure districts and that the reverse was true in high expenditure communities.

From the data on 45 communities we described and categorized the community characteristics such as age, population, rate of growth of the community, and the level at which public schools are supported. We examined these community characteristics in relation to the informal board selection procedures in these communities on such questions as whether election contests are the rule or the exception, whether the political parties are included in the nominating process, and whether local religious groups take an interest in school elections. We noted the ways in which the press and womens groups can make a more rational selection of candidates possible, the ways in which communities make their wants known by occasionally recalling or defeating incumbents, and the crucial role of the superintendent of schools in maintaining a stability basic to orderly selection procedures (and the great unrest that ensues when he either can't or doesn't keep the system in equilibrium).

We found that boards of education are indeed, as we suggested earlier, the primary media through which community values about the public schools are expressed. We had evidence about the ways in which communities express these beliefs as choices they make through voting, and of the kinds of problems that arise in districts that deny voters the opportunity to make such choices.

Out of the data from our field studies and our analyses of voluntary association activities, we postulated two opposed forces in the field of work of the school board. One is generated by that part of the population most interested in the clientele of the school, the children, and is pressing for extension of educational services, for the increase of school expenditures, and therefore for increases in the taxes that support them. The opposing force is generated by that portion of the population most interested in the reduction of taxes.

Apparently natural coalitions occur in the process of working out agreements within this force-field. For instance, it seems clear that Parent-Teachers Associations come into being as a response to expectations that teachers can get higher salaries and parents can get better services for their children if they work together to counteract the influence on budget decisions by taxpayers' associations. On the other hand, as district operations become larger and more complex, it becomes obvious to teachers' associations that parental demands for extending school services often result in less of an increase in individual teacher salaries; or, conversely, it becomes evident to parents that a large budget increase that goes entirely to increase teachers' salaries leaves the parental demands for increased services unsatisfied. The taxpayers' associations, too, find it profitable from time to time, through political intermediaries, to form at least two kinds of coalitions. One such alliance, with the teachers' associations, allows increases in staff benefits at the expense of school services. Another type of coalition now beginning to emerge between taxpayers and parent groups attempts to maximize services through capital expenditures, and to reduce personal service outlays, at the expense of teacher association interests.

Attitude Toward Controversy

We gave quite a lot of attention to the possibility that we could generalize from what we now know of board behavior about one overwhelmingly dominant value, seemingly universally held by boards of education, which is the view that controversy is bad and is to be avoided at all costs. This generalization seemed at once to explain the generally conservative position of most school boards most of the time, since they tend to react to any proposal for change not in relation to the value of the specifics of the proposal, but rather in terms of the disruption and controvesy that would attend their adoption. Like Hamlet, they seem to prefer to suffer the ills they have, rather than fly to others they know not of. We thought that perhaps with this constant variable in school board behavior identified we could begin a taxonomic expansion of the dominant values held by the various voluntary associations, such as cost cutting held by taxpayers, higher salaries by school staff, better education held by parents, and others such as efficiency concerns, etc. Given the logical arrangement of associations paired with their dominant values, we hoped to get estimates of probable behavior of boards under pressures to make changes in programs, or to increase salaries, or to cut taxes or services, under the constraints we already knew we could control, such as financial ability and general demand for educational services. However, the taxonomic expansion gave us too many variables to work with, a ubiquitous problem that plagues even those who try to predict the behavior of racehorses with the aid of computers. I still think there are promising possibilities that would justify further efforts along these lines, but with our level of sophistication in handling the problem, which wasn't very high by present data processing standards, we found no way to move our probabilities much above the level we could achieve with only ability and demand data, which, as I indicated earlier, was a probability level of about 75 percent.

We were constantly troubled with another perennial problem of inquiries into social behavior, which is the problem one faces, once he has identified a variable by such techniques as taxonomic expansion, of moving to the selection of appropriate and quantifiable data to represent that variable in an equation. We recognized repeatedly that we were compounding our problem by our ineptness in not keeping our taxonomic categories discrete. One cannot talk sensibly about taxpayers, for instance, in relation to teachers and parents if one ignores the fact that an individual may at one point in time be in one category, or two, or in all three categories. Thus the notion that we could estimate sizes of several segments of a district's population and use them to make estimates of how the pressures they could bring to bear on boards of education would affect the board's behavior turned out not to be a viable notion, at least within our capabilities for testing it.

In much of my work to date I have used correlates of fiscal ability and demographic characteristics of populations as independent variables and estimated their influence on school expenditures as a dependent variable. School expenditures used in this way is really a proxy for something much more complex, a measure of school output. However, I never have been satisfied with expenditures as a correlate of school productivity, partly because expenditures are such an indirect proxy for output, giving no recognition to efficiency in production of school services; so we devised a more defensible correlate of output, achievement scores on standardized tests. Again, we found a high correlation between the output measure and the socio-economic data from which we sought to predict it by school districts. Subsequently some work done at my suggestion by the Fels Institute showed that it is possible to predict mean achievement scores by individual schools within a large district with very high levels of confidence, directly from a few items of data descriptive of the population. Since this work was done, of course, the Coleman study and others have increased the evidence that socio-economic characteristics and school achievement are highly intercorrelated.

We considered a much broader measure of institutional success or failure than has ever before been attempted, to my knowledge, in school studies. This criterion is based on the assumption that any institution is responsive to societal expectations; it can be presumed healthy while serving the clientele it was created

2

to serve, and ailing when clientele are lost to competing institutions.

The quantifiable data needed to apply this criterion are readily available in the percentage of the total school-age population served by the districts. We began this inquiry with an assumption of a general institutional failure for the public schools in the last century arising out of its failure to adapt to Roman Catholic expectations. Then during World War I a second general failure to meet the expectations of first, the military, and then industry, in the realm of manpower training, led to the creation of the federal programs of vocational education, and vast training programs administered and financed within the military establishment and in industries. Finally, we noted the persistent and continuing failure of the public schools to adapt to the expectations of the lower classes in our society which resulted in the steady rate of school dropout for lower-class children. We expected such a criterion to be useful in analyzing the responses of boards of education to the pressures generated by the various sub-publics in their population.

Forecasting Board Behavior

Gradually it began to dawn on us that we were in possession of insights that we were not using, that our concern for predicting school board behavior in relation to fiscal decisions was blinding us to other opportunities. We began to work from our descriptive data to more dynamic prediction models to forecast behavior of boards under certain other sets of conditions. The development of such models is a substantial task, and one for which we had to develop capabilities in our staff. I can indicate the direction of my thinking by the following illustration. With our interest in board behavior, we selected some critical incident in a given district, such as the decision to accept or reject an innovation like a language laboratory, or a new mathematics curriculum. We assume that the board seeks responses to the alternatives by considering several sets of factors representing such elements as the community, the staff, and the superintendent of schools. These sets might be viewed in a diagram or model as "boxes," each containing many variables. The board must assess its fiscal situation; low fiscal ability inhibits high-cost responses.

The community "box" must be consulted, and ethnic, religious, social class, and political factors, as well as the degree of heterogeneity of the district population on any of these factors, will help shape the choice. The professional staff "box" must be consulted, where the age of staff, professional competency and orientation, and general morale will be factors determining acceptance or rejection of the proposition. Certain institutional characteristics of the school, its size, prestige, reputation for leadership, degree of bureaucratization, all will weigh into whether the action is appropriate from an institutional standpoint. The board itself is a "box" in this model, responding one way if representative of the community and quite another way if it is not. Finally (and not necessarily in this order) the board assesses the stance of the administrator. When all factors are favorable the problem is easy to solve; and given some information about the system, the conditions under which the board may act positively in spite of one or more negative responses also should be predictable.

We began the refinement of some models of board action on a post-hoc basis, that is, by working backward from a decision, in order to learn the steps by which to devise some true predictions of action before the fact. Then we moved into the field, first to try our hand at predicting outcomes of selected situations, and finally to see if we could alter circumstances at critical points in the process to make desired behavior result from altered conditions. We found opportunities to concentrate staff resources from time to time in several communities particularly interested in extensive analysis of their decision-making.

It should be apparent at this point that our work has led us into a model of inquiry now generally called systems analysis. Our move into the field in an attempt to apply this model, both for prediction and for identification of variables to be manipulated so as to induce change, took us out of the domain of inquiry as the university defines it, and into the province of the consulting firm. Our Carnegie funds ran out at about this time, and since I had no interest in starting a consulting firm, we completed the dissertations then in process, reported our work through the Cubberley Conference and the *American School Board Journal,*[6] and ended the project.

Summary

As I have thought about our work it has occurred to me that in our analysis of school boards we dealt with different levels of perception as our experience developed, and that the record of slow and blundering progress might be useful to others who would make some rapid progress in such studies. I will therefore attempt to summarize what I think I understand now of our progress.

We began in each instance with an interest in personalities, of problems perceived by superintendents, or board members, or others. At this level of perception we may find data ranging from idle gossip to thoughtful and analytical statements of personal experience of the memoir or autobiographical types. The material is often interesting, frequently instructive, but one comes eventually to be struck by the uniqueness of an individual's perception, experience, and impact on other individuals and events, to the degree that one despairs of making useful predictions of how one person will behave by studying another.

We moved to a higher level of perception when we become concerned with events, such as the dismissal of a superintendent, or the recall of a board member, or the passing or failing of a bond issue or of a tax election. At this level of perception we find typical chronicles, such as board minutes, newspaper stories, and carefully developed case studies, to be our most useful data. Here again, however, the uniqueness of events leaves one eventually hapless about predicting an occurrence of one event from a study of the characteristics of another.

We began to have greater confidence in our perception of school board action when we began to study certain phenomena related to their performance, such as the ethnic and religious and economic characteristics of the population they serve, and to think conceptually about dynamic relationships of such phenomena in field situations. This led us to the general concept of conflict and its management which is elegantly discussed in Jim Kelly's dissertation.[7] This is perhaps the most useful conceptual framework within which to think about school board functioning in our time, both for analytical purposes and for practical aspects such as the day-to-day management of school affairs.

We find from our analyses that the traditional view of school boards as policy-makers is no longer a useful notion. Policy for education in this country is being steadily expanded at state and federal levels and written into statutory and administrative law. School boards are moving from a legislative role into a quasi-judicial role. Instead of legislating, they hold hearings on conflict, either within the school, such as conflict between administrators and teachers over salaries and conditions of work; or on matters that have created conflict between the school and community, such as the fitness of a teacher, or ideological arguments over curriculum. The personal behavior that triggers such conflict, or the event that precipitates the crisis, is relatively unimportant; the important concept, and the one board members and the administrators they employ need to heed, is that the potential for crisis is always with them in ideological differences among residents of the community related to morality, to religion, to politics and economics, and to racial and ethnic origins. The lesson to be learned from dealing with conflict situations is that prompt diagnosis and quick remedial action on personal behavior problems and potential crisis events is essential, for the most trivial behavior or event can trigger a crisis if not dealt with promptly. Delay permits a snowballing effect, so that a controversy between a pupil and teacher not settled in the classroom adds proponents to each side if it moves to the principal's office. If the principal delays a day, parental proponents are added overnight. If the controversy isn't settled in the principal's office but must go to central administration, more proponents are added, and if the board of education must hold a hearing on the matter, voluntary associations are likely to become interested. If the board fails to find a solution, all of the hobgoblins associated with religious bigotry, racism, political radicalism, and general paranoia are loosed to ride through the community until settlement is made of the enormously expanded controversy at the level of the state education department or in the courts. Thus it pays to have administrators who view every controversy as potentially a supreme court case, and act accordingly to get it settled as near the point of origin as possible. By the same token, board members will be well advised to identify early in his career any administrator with a tendency toward "passing the buck" and see that he is removed from line responsibility.

Boards in their quasi-judicial role find themselves increasingly engaged in adjudication of conflicts between the growing body of universalistic policy for education being written into state and federal law, and the application of that body of law to particular situations.

It is perhaps time to rewrite our school administration textbooks, and to rephrase our popular rhetoric about school board functioning, to bring them both into closer alignment with reality in this last half of the twentieth century.

NOTES

[1] Joseph Marr Cronin, "The Board of Education in the 'Great Cities,' 1890-1964," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1965.

[2] Jay Donald Scribner, "A Functional-Systems Analysis of School Board Performance," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1965.

[3] James A. Kelly, "Conflict Resolution and California School Board Recall Election," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1966.

[4] George S. Counts, *The Social Composition of Boards of Education,* (Chicago: Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, 1927).

[5] NEA Research Bulletin, *Focal Authority of City School Boards,* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950).

[6] "The Cubberley Conference: School Boards in an Era of Conflict," *The American School Board Journal,* CLIV (March 1967).

[7] Kelly, "Conflict Resolution."

4. City School Boards: What Can Be Done?

ROALD F. CAMPBELL

I have chosen to discuss the future of city school boards. I do this for two reasons: first, I have been most intimately involved in recent years with city schools and city school boards; second, while many school boards appear to be in trouble, city school boards seem to have even deeper trouble. City school boards are, of course, affected by the general conditions which pertain in the cities. There are those who think cities, particularly large cities, are beyond redemption and should simply be marked off. Indeed, crises in our largest city, New York, seem to give credence to such a view. But cities and their school boards in Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, and in many other places also face great difficulties. If we give up on cities, we give up on the nation. Already 70 per cent of our population lives in urban areas and that percentage will undoubtedly increase in the future. When I speak of cities, I not only include the large central cities, but also smaller cities and many of the surrounding suburban school districts, more and more of which are coming to resemble city school districts.

The growing urbanization of school districts will probably also be augmented by a continual reorganization of school districts. In some twenty years operating school districts have been reduced in number from over 100,000 to about 20,000 and I suspect the end is not yet. Further, reduction in numbers will probably mean the elimination of most small rural districts and a number of small suburban enclaves as well. Many of the districts formed in this process will probably possess the character of present day city school districts. Thus, while city school districts of 50,000 or more in total population number only 130 today, that number will undoubtedly be increased in the years ahead and many other school districts will tend to resemble city school districts. This development plus the fact that a majority of our school pupils are already found in urban districts make it apparent that a consideration of the future of the city board of education is not an isolated but a general problem.

A School Board Tradition

Even at the risk of overlapping some of the considerations offered by David Tyack, I would like to deal briefly with the tradition of the city school board, a tradition which developed, for the most part, early in this century and flourished until about the time of World War II. First of all this was a period of great growth in cities. In 1910 we had 228 places of over 25,000 and by 1940 we had 412 such places. City school districts during this period were often the leading school districts. One need only recall the proud history of Detroit, Cincinnati, or San Francisco to recognize that many enlightened educational practices were followed in our city districts.

Cities were, of course, a product of our growing industrialization. Most of our industry was located in the cities. As a result, the tax base for schools and other public services was favorable. Cities during this period also housed all classes of people — the poor and the rich, the blue collar workers and the professionals, the foreign born as well as old line Americans. Negro migration from the South had begun but percentages of Negroes in most of our cities was small. Teachers and other school personnel were easily attracted to the cities. Salaries were better than in rural districts, educational practices were often advanced, and the urban situation was seen as having many cultural and social advantages.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were also the period of system-wide development of school districts in our cities. At one time many cities had multiple school districts. For instance, Chicago in 1851, even though its area and population were a fraction of what they are today, had seven school districts. In that year the power to employ teachers was taken from the local districts and in 1853 the position of city superintendent of schools was created, "to grade the schools and to introduce order and unity into the system."[1] Clearly, our first consolidation of school districts came within the cities. Many of the factors surrounding boards of education reflected the thrust toward the development of a unified school system. The election or appointment of board members at large was one reflection of such a thrust. The employment of a city-wide superintendent of schools was another example. The development of city-wide standards for the curriculum, school personnel, and school plant represented other examples.

Membership on a city board of education during this period was often seen as a sacred trust. Leading members of the community, particularly from the worlds of business and the professions, were placed on boards. At least as an ideal, an elitest concept governed the selection of persons for a place on the board. While these board members did not come from all segments of society, many of them appeared to take their charge seriously and tried to serve all parts of the community. Many of these business and professional leaders were not far removed from the farm and labor segments of the population and it may have seemed fairly easy in that less complex society for them to serve with some success all levels of the population.

School boards became impressed with their autonomy. While city districts, longer than others, remained dependent in some ways on mayors and city councils, the desire to keep the schools out of politics was a persuasive argument in cities as well as elsewhere. Thus, city boards gradually became less responsive to political parties and to city councils, and more responsive to the ever growing delegation of power from state legislatures. Unfortunately, in this process the needed relationships with local government and with other local agencies was also largely ignored. As a result, for instance, in most cities, parks had no relationship to school grounds and school health often had no relationship to the public health program. In this context, schooling tended to become synonymous with education.

While the position of superintendent of schools was created in the 1830's, the position was not common until after the Civil War.

Professional training for the position had to wait until the present century. Cubberley & Strayer, early architects of the superintendency, stressed the need to develop a unified school system. Earlier, the superintendent was often in charge of the instructional program and a coordinate officer, the business manager, was in charge of the business program. In time, the business manager was placed under the direction of the superintendent and the superintendent became the executive officer of the board. With the increase in the size and complexity of the school enterprise in cities, many superintendents became not only chief administrators, but also chief policy makers for the school system. While some of these superintendents may have sought the policy making role, there was also a willingness on the part of many boards of education, when faced with complicated problems, to thrust the policy making role on to the superintendent.[2] This reached a point in many city school districts where it could be said with considerable truth that the superintendent ran the schools.

New Constraints on City Boards

But as most of you are well aware city school boards can no longer operate in the old tradition. Cities have changed and with these changes a new set of constraints have been imposed on school boards. To begin with there has been a great change in the composition of the population. The white middle class moved into the suburbs. These people were replaced by lower class migrants, most of them black, some Puerto Rican, some Mexican-American, and some Appalachian white. The migration of the middle class out of the city has taken a large part of the old leadership for school boards and for other civic purposes.

In addition to these population shifts there has been a decentralization of industry. New industrial sites are found around the city, often near the airports, not in the city. Thus at the very time that cities need more tax revenue for all social services, including education, the tax base necessary to provide that revenue has been eroded. Most cities get little redress for this condition at the hands of state legislatures; often their only recourse is to turn to the federal government. At present, the federal government seems more inclined to respond to the states than to the cities; hence, city school boards have never been in such dire financial circumstances.

Traditional curricula, traditional teachers, and traditional organizational arrangements in city schools do not serve well the new population of the city. Many students do not learn. In fact the longer they remain in school, the more they fall below national achievement standards. Pupils in grade two may be six months behind, by grade six two years behind, and by grade eight three years behind. Lower class parents once docile, even apathetic, are up in arms about the failure of the school. These parents have been joined by a good many other critics of the school and as a result there is perhaps less faith in the efficacy of the school than at any time since Horace Mann. Instead of school board service being a sacred trust exercised by genteel people, it has become an enervating duty often subjected to the scrutiny of raucous on-lookers.

In place of building a city-wide school system school boards are now confronted with demands for local control. To some in the ghetto, local control means complete local jurisdiction on such matters as the course of study, the selection of teachers, the discipline of youngsters, and the determination of the budget. Even building construction is to involve local planning and the employment of local labor. Extremists in this movement will brook no regulation from the board of education, the state legislature, or even the federal government. Only in terms of revenues do they expect to benefit from all levels of government. To be sure, there are many parents who are less demanding than those mentioned above but even these people are insisting on more local participation and more positive results from the schools. A major question before city school boards is one of deciding which functions can be decentralized and which can not.

Demands for local control are not limited to the parents. The students, particularly in secondary schools with large minority group enrollments, are demanding a piece of the action. Black history, black teachers, and black principals are often elements of this demand. Student activists are frequently stimulated by the more militant leaders of the minority groups. Many of these leaders have given up on the adults and think their chance of getting results rests mainly with the young people. Up to this point efforts to whip up militancy among the young have been relatively successful. There are, of course, many parents and adult leaders of minority groups who do not condone revolutionary approaches. Many of these people are not sympathetic with separatism in any of its forms. Their militancy comes in the form of insisting that minorities have equal opportunity to make it within the system. This means equal opportunity for jobs and for education — not just menial jobs, all kinds of jobs; not just vocational education, all kinds of education.

In face of these new demands membership on the board of education is no longer reserved for the elite. There is an increasing call for representation on the board of education. The Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexican-Americans demand places on the board. In turn, the back-lash whites become fearful of the policies these new members will espouse and they demand representation on the board. For instance, some residents of Northwest and Southwest Chicago complain bitterly about their lack of representation on the Chicago board. These persons have induced their representatives in the Illinois legislature to sponsor bills requiring election of board members from regional areas in the city. These developments also contribute to a splintering of a city-wide school system. Any plan of busing pupils from crowded black schools to less crowded white schools, for instance, runs into immediate opposition, opposition hidden behind the neighborhood school concept.

As part of this ferment in city schools, teachers unions have become more militant. Demands for local control create real fear in many teachers that state or city-wide certification will be discarded in favor of acceptibility to students and parents. At this point the bureaucratic procedures of a large school system are avidly supported by the union and the rigidities which creep into all organizations are reinforced. In many ways the union supports traditional school board practices long beyond the time when those practices are germane to the times. Part of this rigidity is the right senior teachers have to transfer to more desirable schools. This results in the experienced teachers demanding places in the middle class schools and beginning teachers being placed in the slums. On this issue and many others slum parents and union members are at complete odds. This is the type of conflict with which the new city board of education will be confronted.

The city school crisis has become a matter of great national concern. The federal government must obviously provide some money to help alleviate conditions. But money does not come without strings. Based in part on the example of OEO legislation, provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 required for the first time that school boards identify the children of the poor and that compensatory programs be established for these children. In this Act and in other federal legislation the traditional jurisdiction of the school board was reduced. Many of us think this was necessary but nonetheless, boards were now told what to do, if of course they were to receive the money, instead of exercising their own discretion.

While some federal programs have been shifted to the state, the net effect on local boards of education is much the same — an outside agency making decisions for the local board. In fact, for many city boards state control is more objectionable than federal control. One reason for this is that state departments of education are staffed, for the most part, with school people with rural backgrounds who have little understanding of, or sympathy for city school systems.[3]

In addition to the constraints noted above, city boards are confronted, as are many other agencies, with the long shadow of cost-benefit formulations. Impressed with some success in the Department of Defense, cost-benefit analysis and related approaches are very much in vogue with the federal government. For dollars expended what benefits may be expected is the constant question. This formula is much harder to apply to schooling than it is to defense or to space, but the demand that such application be made permeates federal agencies including those that provide funds for education.

One component of the cost-benefit approach is the demand for a national assessment of education. This effort, financed by foundations and government, was at first resisted by school superintendents and perhaps by some board members. With modifications in procedures, school administrators have accepted the program and it will now be administered by the Education Commission of the States.

National assessment may provide more reliable indexes of the outcomes of educational programs and such measures could become important to the cost-benefit approach. All of these efforts focus attention on the results achieved by school programs. School boards now know that the enterprise over which they exercise stewardship will no longer be accepted on faith. Instead, there must be measurable results.

Future Directions

Projecting the future for city school boards is no less hazardous than prediction in general. Moreover, there is always the problem of confusing what may happen with what ought to happen. All I can do is suggest probable directions based upon what seem to be the observable signs of the times. At best any projection is a contingent one. The future of the city school board is

tion is a contingent one. The future of the city school board is

bound up with the future of the city. We must make cities livable for all kinds of people, we must improve the housing of the poor, we must improve job opportunities for blacks and other minorities, we must reduce crime and delinquency, we must make the air fit to breathe. Unless we do these things, cities are doomed and the outlook for city school boards is bleak indeed.

But school board members can not just wait for others to regenerate the cities. Many citizens in the city are insisting that the school become an agency of social reform as well as a place for the instruction of the young. There are some areas of social reconstruction in which the school can play a part. The location of a new school plant and its relationship to the housing and employment problems of the city may be a case in point. School board resistance to large, centralized public housing projects may be an even clearer case. In other words, school board members must now take account of the social consequences as well as the educational consequences of their acts. This implies a more active political consciousness for board members, a point developed later.

I assume that cities will be made more livable. I also assume that this will be difficult, that it will take time, and that it will require the active participation of many people, including those who live in the slums.

In this process of reconstruction there are difficult days ahead for any public agency. School boards will be seared, their structure may be changed, but I think they can and will accommodate to the problems facing us. These accommodations will take a number of directions, some of which are now suggested.

The board of education itself will tend to become a more *representative* body. The elitest concept of the board, and one with which many of us have been comfortable, is being challenged on many fronts. As noted above, minority groups are demanding representation on boards of education. Any response to provide minority representation brings counter demands from whites who oppose moves to integrate schools or to provide compensatory programs for pupils from minority groups. Even caucus procedures for the nomination of school boards, used in some cities and more commonly in suburban districts, is breaking down. Frequently, an attractive candidate not backed by the caucus has been able to win the election, often on the issue that the caucus itself is a device to thwart the will of the people.

Increasing representativeness of boards will probably come whether board members are appointed or elected. In those districts where the appointment procedure is employed, if appointment does not provide board members from many segments of the community, the procedure will probably be changed by the state legislature. Even if appointing officials are committed to a representative board the achievement of such a goal is not entirely possible. There are, for instance, more ethnic groups and more regional areas in most cities than can ever be accommodated on most boards with seven to eleven members. These difficulties not withstanding, the push for representativeness will probably persist.

Nor will all of these problems be resolved by the election of board members. If elections be at large, some groups will again be left out. This will probably lead to the establishment of areas or wards from which school board members are to be elected. If this be done, each board member will feel responsive to his constituents and less responsive to the total needs of the school system. At its worst, this system could make each board member a dispenser of patronage in his own area. This prospect may lead to some board members being elected from particular areas and some at large. In any case, I suspect we are in for a period of restructuring school boards in an attempt to make them more representative.

Closely related to representativeness is a second direction, that of greater *citizen involvement.* A decade or so ago many school men complained about the apathy of citizens, particularly those living in slum neighborhoods, regarding school affairs. Perhaps as part of the civil rights movement and a growing consciousness of the needs of the poor the situation has changed completely. Citizens are demanding a hearing. If school principals do not listen, demands are then taken to superintendents and board members. If appeals fail there, complaints are then carried to the state legislature and if need be to the Congress and various federal agencies. To help in assessing such appeals, the Congress and administrative agencies may use field workers in local communities to provide information about [illegible] which may not come through official channels.

A growth in citizen participation means that the professionals will play a smaller role in decision making than they have in the past. It seems entirely likely that the unions, which have come to wield great power in the large cities, will have that power significantly challenged by citizens. Certification procedures, transfer policies, promotion plans, and many other bureaucratic arrangements dear to union members will be changed because citizens will not put up with them.

In this process there will not be much patience with due process. Many lower class parents feel that due process is for the purpose of protecting other people and it is now their turn to decide who shall teach and what shall be taught. A few months ago I saw a group of parents insist that the Woodlawn Community Board demand that the Chicago Board of Education transfer a teacher found objectionable by Negro students. The regulations regarding transfer, definitive as they were, did not deter these parents from achieving their objective.

Many principals, superintendents, and other administrative officials will also find their decision making prerogatives challenged by citizens. The idea that the schools belong to the people is being taken seriously. In this shift of power, some of the expertise possessed by teachers and administrators will be ignored. In time, however, this challenge may have salutory results. The professionals in the schools will be required to listen to citizens much more than they may have done. Moreover, the questioning of the knowledge base of the professionals may motivate the improvement of that knowledge base.

Increased citizen participation suggests the third direction, the *decentralization* of city school systems. In contrast with the press of a few decades ago, the creation of city-wide school systems, the press today is for more flexibility, less standardization, and more local variation. In many places the demand is for local control. Most people when questioned about local control mean local participation but they all mean that the desires of parents should make some difference in what is done in the school of the immediate neighborhood. This whole movement has become one

One of the real problems surrounding decentralization or local control is that of definition. In any organized society each subsystem or unit is to some extent dependent upon the larger system. Thus, there are some things that may be decentralized and others that cannot. Clearly, to decentralize financial support would be tragic. It seems doubtful that teacher certification and major curriculum developments such as the new mathematics, can be decentralized. On the other hand, teacher selection and certain curriculum adaptations should reflect local conditions. Work-study programs, for instance, should obviously be related to the work opportunities of a particular neighborhood. Even in this area, however, some schools may have to go beyond their own neighborhoods if an adequate program is to be developed. Decentralization should help establish interdependence among the parts of the system, not isolation. What this means in practice is one of the real challenges ahead.

In any plan of decentralization school principals must play a key role. In large city or small it is the principal and the faculty of a single school that makes decentralization a reality. Programs of teaching and learning are organized and implemented at the school level, not at some regional or system-wide office. Parents need to be heard as individuals and perhaps also through some kind of elected parent council at the school level. Any participation of citizens at other levels should supplement not replace what is done at the school level.

Most boards of education have a long way to go to encourage, permit, and achieve participation at the school level. It means more careful selection of school principals — principals who can work with teachers, pupils, and parents. It means more delegation of responsibility and authority to these principals. It means a slimming down of central and regional administrative offices in favor of providing assistance to principals as the operating line officers of the school system.

In addition to strengthening school operation at the school level, large cities will probably have to decentralize into regions or sub-districts. In some places this may take the form of legally dividing a large city school district into smaller city school districts as is now being done in New York City. In other cities a single school district may be retained as a legal entity but bona fide regions or sub-districts will be created within the structure. We have not been too successful with such plans to date, perhaps because superintendents and boards were loath to delegate any powers to the subdivisions, but experience in St. Louis and other cities may suggest useful beginnings in this direction. For the immediate future it seems most important that various models of decentralization be tried and evaluated.

Whether by legal subdivision or by administrative arrangement it seems quite clear that the central board of education, or council as it is to be called in New York City, develop a federated school system. If large school districts are legally subdivided this central body will become, in some sense, an intermediate unit of school administration. This intermediate unit should exercise certain limited powers, chiefly those having to do with long-term planning and with the equitable distribution of money. Actual operation of schools would be left almost entirely to the newly created districts and their boards of education. Even if a large city remained as a single school district much the same transfer of power to the regions or sub-districts must take place. The sub-districts might have sub-boards of education or at very least committees of citizens who have considerable influence with sub-district administrators and whose recommendations are taken most seriously by the central board of education.

As a fourth direction, and one already alluded to, the board of education of the future will function more frankly and more fully as a *political* force. This projection follows from more representative boards and greater citizen influence with boards. This may not take the form of partisan politics in the traditional sense. Political action in cities, even now, does not always follow the two party system; frequently, there are new coalitions and fusion parties. But whether through old parties or new there does not seem to be any way by which the board can remain out of politics.

Boards will be required to deal with other agencies such as those in health, welfare, housing, and law enforcement. In many cases these relationships will require a knowledge of political forces affecting these agencies and certainly in some cases effective collaboration between the school board and the other agencies cannot take place unless it is solidified at the political or governmental level. In this process of coalition and collaboration school boards will be required to exercise more political influence than they have in the past.

Already the great dependence of boards of education on actions taken by state legislatures is apparent. Any appreciable money demand on the part of teachers ends up with an appeal to the state legislature. Boards of education can raise money only within the limits established by the legislatures and those limits are frequently well circumscribed. This requires frequent appeals to the legislature and I suspect boards are going to become more adept through political coalitions in making these appeals.

In like manner boards may be expected to increase their effectiveness in the political realm at the national level. It is only a decade ago since many boards were debating the advisability of accepting federal funds. Very little reluctance on that issue remains. It now seems clear that city boards will seldom get all they need from state legislatures, hence they will be required to go to the federal government. With this recognition will come a determination to be as effective as possible politically at the national level. Again, coalitions will be required. Some of these may be with general city government, others may be with city boards across the country.

As a fifth direction, I suspect boards must deal much more than they now do with the purposes, procedures, and *results* of public education. Public education has numerous critics including many of its own clients. Part of this criticism stems from lack of understanding, part from lack of involvement, and part from the fact that in many cases a poor job is being done. Inevitably boards must deal with money but too often they have dealt inadequately with what the money is designed to buy. More money for the same programs will no longer do. There is a growing demand that increases in resources be related to programs which at least promise to be more effective.

Even the promise of effectiveness is not enough. There is an increasing demand that boards be held accountable for results. On every hand there is a call for appraisal and evaluation. Sometimes this is framed in input-output terms or as cost-benefit analysis. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Coleman Report was a new definition of equality which emphasized outcomes and not merely opportunities.[4] If boards are to be held accountable for results, they will need to tie plans of evaluation to all programs and become much more sophisticated in using evaluation data than they are at present.

By way of summary, I have tried to describe the school board tradition as it developed prior to 1940 and to suggest the contraints that began with World War II and that have made the early tradition untenable particularly in an ever-increasing urban society. Finally I have suggested that city boards will tend to become more representative, that boards will deal more extensively with citizens, that boards will oversee some form of organizational federation in which many functions are decentralized, that boards will play a more active political role at all levels of government, and that boards will be called upon to deal more fully with the evaluation of results than they do at present.

I have tried to be objective in this analysis. Some of these directions please me, some do not. I do not espouse them, I describe them.

Let me close this paper with a few personal convictions.

If city board members are to work effectively in this emerging world, they will have to reconsider their own roles and the ways they allocate their time. I suspect board members need to listen more than they do at present. Meetings should somehow deal with policy more and daily operation less. Extensive time demands such as board members serving as members of negotiating teams for weeks on end should be terminated. Board members may have to have more help in sifting out and checking crucial information. Constantly, a board member must seek to understand the big picture and be determined to represent the people of his city in seeking the best possible school programs for the children, youth, and adults of the city. The board member cannot become captive of the superintendent or of the teacher's union or he loses his effectiveness.

As in all representative government, the board member must represent his constituents, but he must do more. As he learns more about the school enterprise, I hope he will also lead his constituents. If board members can accommodate to the developments suggested here, they will have an important even though a different place in the future years ahead.

NOTES

[1] Elwood P. Cubberley, *Public School Administration* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1929). 72.

[2] See James D. Koerner, *Who Controls American Education?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), ch. 5.

[3] See Roald F. Campbell *et al.*, *Strengthening State Departments of Education* (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1967), ch. 4.

[4] James S. Coleman *et al.*, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

5. The Board's Role: Present and Future

JERRY FINE

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The Wall Street Journal recently described the rewards of boardmanship as "a lot of guff for no pay."

Is this an accurate indictment? If so, who is at fault — the board, the public, or both? And what can school boards do to improve their leadership, performance, and prestige?

Jerry Fine addresses himself to these questions in the following paper. But first he introduces his subject with an impressionistic "montage" of observations and comments — a fictional portrait of a modern board in trouble. The Scene which follows, he says, is of "composite persons in a composite place." None of the characters is real.

THE SCENE

Epilogue

All the kings horses and all the kings men. . . . The community was in shambles. No broken windows or physical harm to its citizens, but emotions were laid bare and what had been said and done was indelible . . . or indelible enough. The pressure built up so quickly, was so intense and attitudes so frightening that some people began wondering about themselves . . . about the companions they had acquired. Some wanted to speak out but didn't. A few did. Some felt as if they were awakening from a dream in which they were naked in a crowd . . . exposed. But more, god dammit, were not ready to consign their children to go to school with coloreds.

. . . *I'll bet he doesn't have a high school daughter.*

. . . *It's all right to talk about it, but there just isn't enough money to do it.*

. . . *Pardon me, but if you'll just look at the budget recommendation . . .*

. . . *Shut up! If I wanted my kids to go to school with niggers I would have moved there instead of where I live.*

. . . *We still have some rights and look around you. We all come from neighborhood schools.*

. . . *But the high school your children attend is three miles aw . . .*

. . . *We just don't have the money. Our schools are great just the way they are. And nobody, including those sons-of-bitches on the school board, is going to tell me to put my child on a bus to go to that school.*

. . . *But he's already traveling on a bus.*

. . . *That's a hell of a lot different and you and the others make me sick. The Communists said they'd do it, but I'll be damned if I'll sign my name to it.*

. . . *But it's only a recommendation and the Community Planning Committee made it.*

. . . *It's stacked. You know it. I know it. No one asked me how I felt.*

. . . *I don't like the plan, but the way people are acting frightens me.*

Rumor, the pacesetter of fear and frustration, set in with a two pronged attack on the plan and the school board members.

About the plan:

. . . *Next thing they'll want to ship them in from outside the district.*

. . . *They wouldn't.*

. . . *Don't bet on it.*

. . . *Of course, it's true. Ask anyone.*

About a school board member:

. . . *If she'd spend some time on the recommendation instead of her daughter's wedding, she couldn't possibly vote for it.*

. . . *With her old man dead, she's probably in charge of the shotgun. Maybe she doesn't have time.*

. . . *That's right. Three month's pregnant.*

. . . *They said what? Mother, how can they be so cruel?*

There were calls, letters, threats, insults. Most were directed to the school board — the enemy.

. . . *Everyone knows they're going to put it over on us whether we like it or not.*

The board meeting.

. . . *Move that the recommendation be denied.*

. . . *Second.*

. . . *Discussion?*

. . . *All in favor.*

. . . *Opposed.*

. . . *Passed.*

The benediction was in order.

The community was spent. But its emotions were at the ready in case anyone doubted it was not prepared to defend its rights. The surging, confused, jumbled, swirling nightmare was over. The problem remained.

"The way to begin is to begin." (Martin Luther King)

The Place

MIDCITY (population 103,425). The setting is very . . .

Culture Groups. People from many nations make their homes in Midcity. Many date their ancestry from the Puritans and in some ways preserve the characteristics of their ancestors. A recent addition to this friendly city are Negroes who add to the diversity of citizenship along with those of Mexican-American and Oriental descent.

Location, Size and Description. This charming city by the Bay is noted for its industriousness and industry and is located near major population centers. It measures 12.3 square miles and most of its land is in use for residential, commercial and industrial purposes . . .

Education. Free public schools were established in 1882. There are 10 elementary schools, 2 junior high schools and 2 senior high schools. The superintendent who is in charge of the schools is hired by the five school board members who are elected by the people. Education is compulsory and there are approximately 12,000 children in the public schools.

The School Board

Sam McCarter is a supervisor in a Midcity toy plant where he has been employed for thirty years. He graduated from Midcity High School, spent two hitches in service and came back married and ready to settle down in the community he had lived in almost all of his life. He had a kind of mediocrity that followed him wherever he went. He had never felt important except when he participated in his service club or the youth baseball league and on either side of these activities when he drank. In recent years this latter activity was not so well shielded from the community as before but what's the difference in a community where the average resident is in the community for only five years, only one out of four who are qualified vote in school board elections and only 25 - 50 attend board meetings. What do they know and what do they care. Sam was on his fourth term on the board and this would be his last . . . he thought. Well, he was pretty sure. Four terms is a long time, but what would he do if he wasn't on the board. He was near retirement at work. He had no hobbies.

Sometimes he thought about equality of education and segregation. He really did want to do the right thing, but it wasn't easy with all the heat the community and his friends leveled at him. After all, they had been there long before these new people who were causing all the trouble.

He thought of another kind of equality . . . usually after a few drinks. His vote counted the same as any other board member. It didn't matter whether they had 2, 4, 6 or 8 years of college. They could make all the money they wanted to, but the one man one vote (Supreme Court, you know) rule applied here too . . . with two exceptions. Over the years Roy Neff had been very kind to him while serving on the board with him and had loaned him small amounts of money along the way. That didn't mean that Roy owned Sam, but it did mean that Sam owed Roy. And, a friend is a friend. And if a particular vote is important enough to a friend, then it should be that way with his friends wherever possible. The other exception was Lois Woods. It was a funny thing. They had never discussed it, but it was there. She called to discuss votes from time to time and urged him to take her view. Sam was bright enough and added number and people together pretty well. His view of her view was that if he didn't take her view, Lois was likely to tell her brother who was on the police force to keep an eye on him, keep his resistance to her view in mind, and if he weaved too much, take him in. Again, a friend is a friend and you ought to have one where you may need one.

Lois Woods had many years of school board service behind her, both before and after the death of her husband. The church (fundamentalist), school board and thinning group of women friends took most of her time. Her youngest child (a daughter) was getting married and the others already were married, lived outside the state and had some strange ideas about people . . . the colored and what was going on in the country. It was disturbing to talk about it, and she and her children loved one another so they didn't talk about it. Besides, when she even mentioned her children's views to her friends, they got very upset. She wanted to defend their views except she wasn't comfortable with their views. Her friends were pretty distant from school affairs, but her married children were distant from the community and they just didn't understand the people there . . . or did they? Between her children, her church and her views of long ago (and things were so simple then) life had become more complicated. The community, the courts, the parents, the students, the chamber of commerce, etc. didn't make it any easier. If the problem would just go away, go away, go away . . . School events like graduations (accepting the class), baccalaureate services (It's such a shame that fewer and fewer students attend them.), school luncheons and dinners, award banquets, meetings with the teachers (We've always had such a good relationship with them although some of them are beginning to push like the students.) and administrators (We've always thought so much alike.) and school board meetings (They went well and we accomplished so much . . . and the community wasn't upset.) made her feel good and important to the school district. Now that most of her friends didn't have children in the schools anymore they didn't call about how good or bad teachers were and what they were or weren't teaching. There weren't even calls about how they were carrying on anymore. But as each issue regarding changes in the schools (sex education or dealing with segregation or . . .) arose it was comforting (or was it just interesting) to know how highly people regarded the schools and assured her that the schools were just fine the way they were.

The hardware store was a substantial operation. It belonged to Roy Neff. He had old friends in town just as Lois Woods did but they were from a different branch. He was not uncouth except he was. He made Lois Woods nervous except she was his friend and they usually voted together on issues . . . the ones that seemed to get the community most excited. He didn't have the education Lois did but he had a kind of pragmatic brightness she couldn't muster and a kind of gut response to people for which her courses or degree didn't prepare her. He operated on a prejudice wave length similar to that of Lois and Sam, but he accepted his own views and those of other people easier than they did. His feel for action on items he could essentially see, feel or touch was measurably greater than on the more esoteric and theoretical ones. Moreover, when the law and he disagreed (and in particular when the vocal community was on his side) the law suffered. He often sought and gained fidgety support for his position based on a kind of morality against the immorality of the law as it was stated. Law and order would take a dunking although the feeling that prevailed was that the flag flew better, good laws should be followed and due process was a good idea for those who had the patience for it.

On a five man board three is a majority. Change occurs . . . but usually very slowly and most often when it's less important. Resistance to change may rise very quickly and be very effective.

Out in Front

. . . Leadership.
. . . It's our job.
. . . Absolutely essential.
. . . If we don't who will?
. . . They count on us.
. . . O.K. Let's see. Is it Sam's turn? He's been vice president this year.

. . . *That's right. Well, what about Lois? David didn't run for reelection and that just mixes everything up.*

. . . *That's it. Sam's president and Roy is vice president. We can go out and tell the audience now.*

. . . *Isn't it nice. We've never had any problems with one another. We can always get together on important things.*

. . . *Thanks. You know it doesn't matter who's president. (That's right. That's right. Besides . . . what would I tell Lillian. She'd say it's my turn. And it is. Anyway, if things get tough, Roy can take over.) We can all work together and it's always good for one of us who's up for election to be president. Besides, just holding the gavel doesn't make the difference. We can all say what we want to say. You know I'll never cut you off.*

It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. Write it a hundred times. Perhaps it doesn't. But if the school board can't or doesn't identify its own leadership, what will the community do?

Epilogue (Addendum)

The Midcity School Board survived. Another did not as noted by the Los Angeles Times-Washington Post News Service.

"The [XXX] School Board voted down three school integration measures that would have involved busing, and directed the superintendent of schools to continue his integration plans, but on a voluntary basis. The measures were passed earlier this year, but that was before the election May 20th of two new board members who campaigned on a promise to rescind mandatory busing."

"The leaders are dead. Long live the leaders." (Anon.)

Present

Many of the things school boards do are interesting but few are of consequence in the sense of being responsive to the most urgent needs of education.

An examination of the present role of the school board is an overwhelming and awesome task. The differences in the size, composition and wealth of the school population and the community result in significant differences in school board functions.

They vary from the concept that the school board mans the teacher complaint desk to the actual position that the continued existence of the school district may depend on the action taken by the school board. The dissimilarities at the less complex end of the scale are highlighted by the responses to an accusation by a statewide teacher organization that a large number of school districts were not complying with a law requiring school boards to adopt a policy to provide for meeting with teachers about salaries and other items under certain circumstances. An inquiry about the stated lack of compliance brought these typical and illustrative responses:

(1) "Ours is a small district. We do not have enough employees to form a committee. Our board is available to all employees at all times."

(2) "Since I am the only teacher in this one room school, and since I see one or more of the board members every day plus most of the parents, I didn't think a special policy was needed. Please correct me if I am wrong."

(3) "There is only one teacher at this school. The teacher is also the principal and the secretary to the board of trustees. The relations between the trustees and teacher have been excellent."

If only the size of school districts is considered in connection with the role of school board members, contrasting student populations of 50, 500, 5,000 50,000 and 500,000 emphasize the differences in possible and actual role. The relevancy between the school board role in the small district and the large district is clear. It is from nominal to nonexistent.

The presently performed and generally successful segment of the school board role is largely ritualistic, functionary and involves the use of modest talents. In most critical issue areas the subject matter is very complex and most school board members (as well as people in general) do not have an adequate understanding to deal well with these issues. The area of school finance is a good example of this inadequacy. Many school board members illustrate their level of understanding of the subject by demanding that the budget be simplified so that they can deal with it more readily. By that they usually mean that it should be reduced in detail and be more informative at the same time.

Some barely approach the matter of finances. Few apply analysis. The inquiry that should be made is whether or not if one had $100,000, $500,000, $1,000,000, $5,000,000, $10,000,000, $50,000,000, $100,000,000 or $500,000,000 to spend annually he would assign the final responsibility for its expenditure to the persons who now have that role. The school board role breaks down (and this is not unusual) in such critical areas as providing disadvantaged children with an adequate educational opportunity. As with finance, existing structure and community attitudes provide severe limitations on what can be done. Generally, however, the school board reflects the attitude of the community. Financial resources are not mentioned as a limitation as a nation that can fly to the moon, build ICBMs and fight costly wars and whose people enjoy the standard of living they do cannot be considered to be limited in this way. Attitude and priority are the most severe limiting factors in this area.

Analysis and Analogy

There is no shortage of literature on the subject of the role of the school board. The fact is that there is a great disparity between description and performance of school board roles. Many school board members are of extreme consequence to the public schools. Most are not, and this is unfortunate. Dedication and good intentions are important qualities but they are not adequate in the absence of skill and talent. The most significant reservoirs of school board member talent exist in the larger urban areas where the problems of education are the least manageable.

The plethora of writings on the role of the school board is largely and usually correct but carries an aura of fantasy when application is considered. "You are hereby instructed to be talented, competent, thoughtful, sensitive, responsive, skillful, . . ."

If creativity and innovation are important goals toward finding a way out of the relatively stagnant, and in many cases disintegrating, condition in which education finds itself and if words could accomplish the job, words such as those contained in *Self-Renewal* by John W. Gardner would almost surely be an appropriate vehicle. The book doesn't appear to change people as much as it lends support for their feelings and objectives in many cases (if they like it), reinforces what they are doing in other cases and must pass in and out of the minds of most. Dramatic change is simply not the result that occurs from people reading a book or listening to a lecture or having a discussion. Extensive challenges of major magnitude and complexity are handled by massive, expensive and intensive applications of money, commitment and talent. Papers such as this only bite away at the fringe of the problem and are largely duplicated in both effort and language by many other similar writings.

The system of boards which is and has been an extensive part of business and government is not likely to change dramatically in structure. The essence of the role has to be who will perform it. Boards of directors of business have a generally better understanding of this than school boards. The role of the former is largely functionary and assumes a critical observers role. Its most significant action is usually in the selection or replacement of the chief executive officer. Frequently a stockholder or group of stockholders exercise a continuing control over the board of directors. The return on investment is a relatively simply measured matter as are comparative performances between businesses. The impact of action or inaction on the part of the school board is not so easily measured. When the business entity is doing well by performance standards, the board of directors has a modest role and management presents the board (or should) with the best available information on the future of the entity. This description of boards of directors of business is grossly oversimplified but substantially correct. It is relevant to the role of school board members although the return on invested capital in education is much more difficult to measure than in the case of a business, and the concept of major stockholders is not generally analogous to the community although it is sometimes similar in terms of exercise of influence.

Someone in the school district needs to have the talent for the use of foresight, be able to exercise it and have the ability to gain the approval of those on whom successful implementation depends. In this context there is a need for setting goals, establishing policies and evaluating results. Policy is not developed ordinarily by school boards but reacted to upon presentation by the superintendent and voted upon. And local control is to be sat upon.

Factors

Many complex factors must be considered, evaluated and their optimum position pursued in order to assess what the role of the school board should be in the future. Some of them are:

(1) The availability and willingness of able, talented people to serve as school board members determines the ceiling that must be placed on the role or the dimensions that will be provided for it.

(2) The importance of the need to forsee and pursue change must be recognized.

(3) Available resources must be evaluated and priorities for use must be established.

(4) Community attitudes must be developed so that the community will understand the need for adequate financing and encourage its allocation to the schools from available sources and in the most equitable manner. For example, the sensible and fair development of educational resources is not possible where richer districts are able to allocate more money per student than the poorer districts. In many ways this type of allocation works inversely to educational needs, priorities and objectives.

(5) When educational needs and objectives are established serious and advance preparation of the community for their advent must be made. In racial issues, for example, this factor has been poorly evaluated and community resistance has been glaringly underestimated. Great information collection and analysis in the identification of failure must take place.

(6) Consideration must be given to optimum school district sizes. As frequently as possible school districts should come within these specifications.

(7) Because community attitude plays such a significant role in the well-being of school districts and is frequently a strong impediment to educational development, a department of communications should be developed. This should be operated from within the district where suitable talent is available and on an outside contract basis where it is not available. Serious defi-

ciencies exist in school districts in this area as well as in personnel which is a job assignment frequently given to persons without special skills.

(8) The analytical aid possibilities inherent in computers must be developed and made available to school districts.

Many other major factors need to be considered but these are among the most important and are illustrative of the critical areas that must be evaluated and pursued.

Assumptions

In suggesting what the future role of the school board should be the following assumptions will be made and they constitute optimum circumstances:

(1) Three member school board. Each member would be elected or appointed for a three year term and the re-election of one member would occur each year. If appointed, citizens committees would make the recommendation. If elected, citizens groups would urge candidates of their choice to run.

This would establish a better opportunity for quicker agreement and better understanding, reduce communication problems between board members themselves and the superintendent and insure that the maximum amount of time a school board majority unacceptable to the majority of voters could remain in office would be two years. Dialogue on educational issues would of necessity be before the community on an annual basis.

(2) The superintendent. The superintendent would receive pay somewhat higher than comparable positions in industry to compensate him for the lack of incentive pay opportunities. He would assume the leadership role in the school district and the primary contact between the community and the school district would be with the superintendent.

The employment agreement with the superintendent would be on no more than an annual basis. His salary should be significantly greater than the administrators on his staff. Horizontal entry into the job would be possible. Traditionally trained superintendents would compete with other applicants. Tougher, more conflict oriented applicants with significant administrative training and experience would surface. Résumés would take on a new look. Curriculum changes would occur at the graduate level to accommodate new job descriptions and opportunities. More talented people would enter the profession because of increased opportunities and more manageable challenges. This is possibly occurring at this moment because of increased interest in teaching and stronger social consciences on the part of young people.

This same concept could apply in other administrative areas such as personnel and communications.

(3) Teachers. Tenure would be eliminated and teachers could be dismissed for failure to adequately perform the duties of the job as well as for cause. A state administrative hearing officer would hear the case if a hearing was requested by the teacher. Appeal from the decision would be available but could be reversed only for abuse of discretion.

Teachers would not have to leave education or become administrators to achieve high incomes. Merit pay would provide for exceptional incomes for exceptional teachers.

(4) Participation in educational program development. Teachers, students and members of the community would be encouraged to participate in all phases of education in the district. For example, policy suggestions would be sought from each, dialogue would occur and the superintendent would recommend whether or not the suggestions should be followed.

(5) Finances. The nation will convert a consequential portion of its expenditures to the advancement of education and borrow where necessary as it would on any other investment where the promise of returns were great.

(6) Research. Expenditures comparable to those made for space and war would be made to help establish need, possibility and methodology.

(7) Size of district. An optimum size range for school districts would be established with appropriate variations for high and low density populations. Large metropolitan districts would be broken up into smaller districts and the economic advantage of small enclaves would disappear and unification into larger more economically and administratively justifiable districts would occur.

As with the consideration of factors, there are other major assumptions, but these exemplify the condition that would exist for the exercise of the future role of the school board member.

Future

Based on the previously stated assumptions, able and talented people in the community would be attracted to the position of school board member. It would offer the satisfaction of being involved in an important event, with people of talent where worthwhile and exciting things are taking place without working a material economic detriment upon school board members.

The future role of the school board member will be increased in significance and reduced in attention to less relevant matters. He will depend more on the superintendent and insist on more from him. The community will focus more on the superintendent and relieve the school board member from the less consequential tasks.

He will concentrate with the superintendent on advance planning and problem solving. Both he and the superintendent will be relieved from consistent harassment of seeking funds with which to operate the school district.

The most important elements of this future role are people with talent who are able to exercise adequate judgment and successfully bring foresight into play.

If I never had a goal,
I would not move forward.
If I never had a dream,
I would never know what might be.
(Anon.)

NOTES

Designing Education for the Future, No. 2, Edited by Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, 1967

Education and Urban Development, Ferendino/Grafton/Pancoast, Architects, Miami, Florida, 1969

School Board Bibliography, H. Thomas James, Director, School Board Studies, School of Education, Stanford University (includes Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations of: Joseph Marr Cronin, Jay Donald Scribner, Frank E. Seeley, Abram G. Konrad, F. Armand Magid, James A. Kelly and Irwin Twining Johnson) 1967

What is the Future of Local Boards of Education? Mrs. Ruth H. Page, Executive Director, New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education, 1968

School District Innovativeness and Expectations for the School Board Role, James Clayton LaPlant, Assistant Professor, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1967

School Boards in an Era of Conflict, Cubberley Conference edition The American School Board Journal, March, 1967

Achieving Nationwide Educational Excellence, Leon H. Keyserling, December, 1968

Governing Education, Edited by Alan Rosenthal, 1969

College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes, Rodney T. Hartnett, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1969

The Development of a Conceptual System for Dealing with Problems of Curriculum and Instructions, John I. Goodlad, University of California, Los Angeles and Maurice N. Richter, Jr., State University of New York at Albany, 1966

6. New Dimensions in School Board Leadership

STEPHEN K. BAILEY

Reviewing traditional — even recent — literature about American school boards is a strange and unsettling experience. It is as though one had entered a time capsule and had suddenly been transported to a previous century. Some organizational landmarks are the same, some structures and procedures and laws are recognizable; but the described value systems and life styles of school boards, and the perceptions of reality of the authors who have written about them, seem romantically archaic and irrelevant.

This is not to denigrate the best of the scholars. They wrote what they observed. But 1970 is not 1965. A whole generation has been lived in these past five years.

When Neal Gross asked, only a decade ago, "*Who Runs Our Schools?*,"[1] it never occurred to him that "pupils" or "neighborhood Blacks" might be plausible answers.

James B. Conant suggested in 1959 that the first essential for a good high school is for the community to have ". . . a school board composed of intelligent, understanding citizens who realize fully the distinction between policy-making and administration."[2] It presumably never occurred to him that racial, religious, nationality, or class "representativeness" on the school board might be far more important than IQ if the schools were not to be starved or poisoned by the fearful and the penurious.

When the leaders of the National School Boards Association called in 1966 for policy decisions affecting education to ". . .

be made as close as possible to where the educational process takes place,"[3] were they aware that the exports of local school board decisions in Mississippi were even then creating horrendous welfare and education problems for New York City?

One looks in vain in the index of Goldhammer's excellent monograph, first published in 1964,[4] for any reference to terms like "strikes," or "collective bargaining." His textual references to teacher groups are so bland, so lacking in the *Sturm* and *Drang* of recent big-city confrontations, as to seem positively Arcadian.

And, of course, references to civil rights questions and federal aid problems are almost totally lacking in either traditional or recent scholarly literature about school boards.[5]

In short, reading standard books, monographs, and articles about school boards is a little like studying modern geography with a pre-World-War-II textbook, and a pre-World-War-I atlas. The continents are there; the mountains and lakes and rivers are there; but nothing else is the same.

How does one begin to make sense out of the recent cataclysmic societal changes that have influenced the character and role of school boards? And how can school boards begin to reassemble their energies and recast their perspectives for the troublesome but potentially promising days ahead?

There are, I am sure, those who question the meaning or the desirability of such efforts. A plausible case can be made out for the proposition that the school board is to American education what the House of Lords is to British politics — a largely useless ceremonial body, all set about with pomposity, but irrelevant to the determination of major issues. The argument here is that by the time the Federal government, state education departments, local professional staffs, militant teacher organizations, John Birch societies, textbook and hardware salesmen, black parents and Panthers, and the local media have completed their macabre Whirling-Dervish dance, local school boards appear to be nothing but awkward wallflowers perversely held responsible for the success of the party.

Is the concept of local control in fact impossibly naive? In a world of giant organizations, big politics, and mass migrations, can a handful of dedicated, unpaid citizens make a difference at the local level? Should they be able to? Can the national interest be squared with the concept of local control?

The answers to these and similar questions are not easy to frame, and in some cases answers will simply evolve rather than emerge in response to normative prescriptions. But it will, I believe, make a difference whether school board members understand the world we are entering. For their only chance of playing a meaningful role in the future of American education is to develop a clear notion of what the new script is all about, and who the other actors are with whom they must cooperate.

For a number of reasons, this paper largely ignores the 8,000 school districts (more than a third of the total) with 300 or fewer pupils. With low budgets and various state mandates, such districts have little chance of exercising meaningful discretions over their own destinies, even if they continue to survive. Furthermore, in terms of the total number of pupils served, such districts are statistically insignificant. (750,000 out of a total public, elementary, and secondary enrollment of 45,000,000.)

The major concern of this paper is with the 4,000 school districts that account for 80% of all the school children in the nation. These are largely urban and suburban districts, and their boards are being hit with a wide variety of unprecedented problems. In modern parlance, this is where the action is.

What are some of these problems, and what does their identification suggest about needed new dimensions in school board leadership?

Four "R's" seem to me of particular significance. race, resources, relationships, and rule.

The key letters and the symbolic words are unimportant. The underlying concepts and issues are:

Race

Robert Benchley once commented that there were two kinds of people in the world: those who thought there were two kinds of people in the world, and those who did not. America is sorely divided into two major groups: those (both black and white) who think that the color of a person's skin is intrinsically important, and those (both black and white) who do not. And, because of the nature of self-fulfilling prophecies in a prejudiced culture, each group can almost prove his case.

There was a time when it looked as though the race problem in education might be solved geographically by a kind of *de facto* apartheid. Central-city schools would become increasingly black; outer-city and suburban schools would become increasingly white.

The first of these phenomenon is happening. The second is not. And any attempt to make it happen would be as weak as the greed or liberality of a single house-owner or subdivider. It is not prophecy, it is a simple extrapolation of reality, to contend that over the next several decades, although there will exist an increasing number of all- or mostly-black schools, there will be a decreasing number of all- or mostly-white schools — at least in the major metropolitan areas where most Americans live. The residential patterns, even by income, will not fall into neat concentric circles, marked inner city, outer city, and suburbs. In fact, they never have. Lots of suburbs are, or contain, slums. And these suburban slums, ("slurbs?") both white and black, are going to be an important part of the future politics of school districting and attendance zoning.

I should be more sanguine about the future of "brindling" the outer cities and suburbs if there were evidence to date that most school boards were skilled in conflict resolution. The evidence here is sparse, but the recent work of Lipham, Gregg, and Rossmiller in Wisconsin seems to suggest that most school boards seek and enjoy consensus, and function largely in a legitimizing rather than decision-making role — "perhaps oblivious to latent conflict . . . typically avoiding manifest conflict."[6] When conflict arises, the typical school board studied in Wisconsin indulges one of three kinds of avoidance behavior (a) delegating the conflict (problem) to the superintendent of schools, (b) postponing action to a subsequent meeting, or (c) referring the conflict to a subcommittee of the board.[7]

By and large, neither school boards nor school superintendents are trained to deal with angry people. And many of the angriest people in the decades ahead will be angry about questions of race. Someday, and may it be sooner rather than later, men will be as amused and unbelieving about human conflicts based upon color as they are presently when they read about the religious causes of the Thirty Years War. But until that day, school systems along with other governmental agencies will be "up-tight" on the subject of what racial mix will be allowed to attend what schools, for what purposes, under whose jurisdiction. The Constitutional questions were solved 15 years ago. The social, economic, political, administrative, and academic questions will be with us for the bulk of the century.

An increasing number of school boards will have to devote an increasing amount of time and energy to the issue of race relations — within the schools and within the community. Many board members will be under cruel pressure (sometimes involving threats to their physical safety) from white racists and from black militants. And these pressures will have to be absorbed or refracted in terms of federal and state constitutional intrepretations, statutes, rules, regulations, and guidelines. Definitions of what constitutes a neighborhood, what constitutes busing for purposes of correcting racial imbalance, what constitutes segregated activity within the schools, what constitutes a segregated curriculum, what constitutes acceptable academic standards, will all be subject to extended and contentious discussion within both white and black communities. Many white and an increasing number of militant blacks want segregation — but on their own terms. Many whites and many blacks want to press with all deliberate speed towards a school system that is truly color-blind. And there are many shades of opinion and hues of caution in between.

The issue for the school boards and for their professional staffs will not be, "'how do I please a majority of whites and blacks at the same time." The issue will be how to deal with the myriad pressures and perspectives from within diverse segments of both the white and black communities — how to develop policies that are politically acceptable and yet are based upon America's constitutional morality. For most school board members, a re-reading of the Declaration of Independence and of the First 15 Amendments of the U.S. Constitution may be essential to the moral and practical fulfillment of their task. Special note should be made of phrases like "all men are created equal;" "inalienable rights;" "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" "redress of grievances;" "due process of law;" "privileges or immunities of citizens;" and, above all, "equal protection of the laws."

These phrases are no longer just items once memorized by school board members when they were in school. These phrases constitute the moral wisdom and the moral mandates that must be applied by school boards to the resolution of conflict and to the rectification of injustice within their own school districts.

The most difficult issues will continue to emerge in the ghettos of our large cities. What do school boards say to blacks and Latins who complain, with understandable bitterness, that they are locked by race, language, and/or poverty into residential patterns they cannot easily break; that middle-class teachers with middle-class backgrounds using middle-class materials do not know how to teach poor kids; that teacher attitudes contribute to the psychological insecurity of the child; that the whole school system is set up for the benefit of college-bound middle-class whites, and is bureaucratized beyond the point where concerned parents can have any leverage? What do school boards say when the demands for decentralization and community control spread from New York to America's urban hinterland? And what if Mr. Shanker's union or militant NEA counterparts, with their own legitimate concerns, spread at the same rate? The forces let loose can easily consume any central school board that happens to fall into the path of the vortex, as they consumed the New York City Board of Education in 1968-69.

Community control on the one hand, and problems of teacher and supervisory rights and gains on the other, come as close as anything I know in our modern society to constituting the irresistable force and the immovable object. If school boards and mayors and legislators and regents and governors act badly, and at times helplessly, in such situations, it is not because everybody is stupid or venal; it is because rationality and compromise — although secure and stable craft in moderate seas — are extremely unstable and leaky during a typhoon.

In any case, if local community leaders and parental groups in the large urban ghettos do, in fact, gain real (as distinct from simply nominal) power over their schools, it will not be surprising if some of the most tenaciously held norms of educational administration are both systematically and unsystematically violated. At least in the early years of experimentation, any hard and fast line between policy and administration as reflecting the respective jurisdictions of boards and supervisors will be even more difficult to maintain than in fact it always has been.

It is my prediction that new community school boards in big cities will need help in learning their trade. The question is, will they accept help from a national association like NSBA (or its state affiliates) whose membership lists so grossly underrepresent the minority populations of this nation.

Resources

If race will constitute a growing issue for school boards in the years and decades ahead, so will the politics of resource accumulation and distribution. In one sense, school finance has always been high on the agenda of school board activity and responsibility. Even in dependent districts, general governments have looked to school governments for counsel, recommendations, and advice.

What is new is that, in state after state, in school district after school district, constitutional, statutory, and political ceilings are being bumped with increasing frequency and trauma. Educational costs continue to accelerate; the forces governing the availability of revenues seemed to have coalesced at an impossibly rigid and inadequate level.

In these circumstances, boards of education have the melancholy responsibility of approving budgets they know to be inadequate, or of submitting budgets to legislatures or to referenda when they know that such budgets will be rejected.

One of the finest illustrations of the Freudian concept of psychological displacement is the behavior of public officials when faced with a taxpayers revolt. Local mayors, managers, councils, and school boards, feeling the heat from local property-taxpayers, begin to stir the coals under the state kettle. Governors, state legislators, and state boards of education absorb this heat for a while, and adjust to it; but then, state taxpayers begin to rebel. At this point, everyone (local and state) begins to put the heat on the Federal government. The Federal government passes all kinds of laws which it then refuses to full-fund because, if it did, it would feed the fickle fires of inflation, or undercut our national security. Some sly characters also remind local and state authorities that, "he who pays the piper calls the tune," and do state and local educational agencies really want the federal control that federal money will "inevitably bring." This sends ripples of discouragement back through the states to the localities; but the local fiscal deficit continues to get worse. School services begin to suffer. School construction is once again postponed — with everyone's knowledge that by the time construction is crunchingly imperative, interest rates and labor costs will have jumped again. Teachers become better organized and less timid. On the other hand, local taxpayers become increasingly adamant. So the heat begins to rise once again, first to the state, and then to the federal level. This time, state and federal priorities are questioned. Are highways, a man on the moon, and Vietnam more important than education? Tables are thumped. Allegations of irresponsibility, or worse, are made. After the 15th incoming telephone call from irate taxpayers at 2:00 a.m., and after the 50th outgoing call to intractable councilmen, state legislators, and congressmen, the school board member wonders why in God's name he ever took the job. And why doesn't the stupid superintendent do something to cut costs without damaging quality? And if the state will not pick up its share of the burden, why will it not at least cut back on its mandates, or adjust the statutory provisions governing tax and debt limits, so that the local school board can behave responsibly?

The fiscal crunch is bound to get worse. Decibels of temper are bound to rise. If the solution were purely local, one might dwell upon the responsibility of local school boards for solving the problem. But the issue is state and federal — even international. What is the leadership role of a school board member in this kind of world?

Relationships

Along with race and resources, two other "R's" will, I believe, dominate the school board agenda of the future: "relationships" and "rule" — problems of coordination and control, partnerships and power.

On the issues of relationships, we have already alluded to intergovernmental fiscal problems on the revenue side. But a host of programmatic and planning relationships are emerging as well, involving grants-in-aid, contracts, lateral coordination, and vertical systems of evaluation and accountability.

In preparation for this paper I have perused the minutes, drawn randomly from across the nation, of more than two-hundred school board meetings. What impresses one is the number of items involving other jurisdictions and levels of education and government. Let me list some "for instances" — and here I quote from selected minutes (italics supplied throughout):

— From Pittsburgh: "That the Superintendent be authorized to conduct, *in cooperation with the University of Pittsburgh,* an experimental project in Grade 5 in selected schools to improve the self-esteem of Negro children."[8]

— From Buffalo: "Directed that the Board President send a telegram to the *Governor, Senate, and Assembly leadership, our local legislators, and the Chairman of the Education and Finance Committee,* communicating to them the Board's alarm with educational budgetary prospects. Also, that copies of this telegram be sent to *the Mayor and all members of the Common Council.*"[9]

— Again from Buffalo: "Instructed Mr. Jones to make a study, *with members of other city departments,* of the feasibility of '*joint purchasing*' as recommended."[10]

— From Philadelphia: "That the School District of Philadelphia *enter into a contract with Temple University* [to] . . . implement a science-mathematics program for junior high schools through the use of computer-assisted instruction, the program to be *financed from federal funds and/or private grants.*"[11]

— From St. Paul: "The Superintendent mentioned that he just received word that *St. Thomas Parochial School* on the East Side of St. Paul had voted to close its doors as of June 1st, 1969. This move indicates that some 350 to 400 additional students must be absorbed into the public schools and this trend in the parochial school system could continue."[12]

— From San Diego: "Mr. Johnson also mentioned a communication to the District from the *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development* concerning advance land acquisition by local governments. Mr. Johnson suggested that the administration aggressively pursue this matter."[13]

— Also from San Diego: "School Board President Dyer commented that she had been the guest of the *San Diego Police De-*

partment at its recent exhibit concerning narcotics and pornography."[14]

— From Rochester: "Letter from *Congressman Horton* expressing thanks for the Superintendent sharing with him *opinions on some federal legislation on education . . .*"[15]

— From Nashville: "The effective date of employment for all of the persons listed [*for Operation Headstart*] is June 19, 1969. The program is reimbursed through OEO."[16]

— From Norfolk: "He then told how the *NAACP and Justice Department* had objected to the Tarrallton Site. This has left the Board with no control over where it can build a school; it has to go in court and ask."[17]

— From Detroit: "A report was presented to the Board indicating the rank order of Michigan K-12 School Districts receiving $50 or more per pupil in *Federal aid* during the 1966-67 school year. Generally, there has been the impression that it is the large cities who are the greatest beneficiaries of Federal aid to education, Superintendent Drachler stated. This report shows that Detroit ranks 26th out of a total of 47 school districts. The highest amount received per child was $265.08, while Detroit received $77.23 per child."[18]

— And, finally, from Columbus: "This program [of Adult Basic Education Classes] is promoted by the Columbus Public Schools, through the Department of Adult Education, *in cooperation with the State Department of Education,* Division of Federal Assistance *and Adult Basic Education under provisions of Public Law 89-750.*"[19]

Perhaps these brief excerpts from Board minutes are sufficient to suggest that school districts are no longer islands. What happens on other turfs, and in once distant places, has an enormous impact upon schools, and consequently on the work of school boards. As the above quotations suggest, an increasing amount of the agenda of school board meetings is devoted to external relationships and to brokerage and resource-aggregating functions involving a wide variety of federal, state, and local, and private partners.

Is local control, at least in its traditional meaning, consonant with this larger, pluralistic, interdependent universe?

Rule

And what about the fourth "R": rule? What has happened, what is happening, to the whole authority structure in education? Who is in charge? Who really determines the course of events?

To the harried board member, almost any answer seems plausible except "the school board." The world he observes is laden with professionals, pressure groups, politicians, parents, pupils, press, and police. Any one of these may seem to have more influence on the course of education at any one time than does the local school board.

Surely, the professionals — the superintendents, principals, teachers, counselors, etc. — are powerful. Perhaps ninety percent of all school board votes in the United States are unanimous and uncritical legitimations of recommendations of professional staff. And as guidelines and regulations from state capitals and from Washington increase in number and technical complexity, and as deadlines for project submissions and evaluation reports become more and more insistent, the tendency of school boards will be to devolve increasing authority and discretion to professional staffs. Knowledge is power — especially in a world of fine print.

But is not the glory of the school board its ability to hire and fire these very professionals, to establish salaries and amenities, to make final determinations of schedules and working conditions?

There are at least a number of school board members, joined by an increasing number of superintendents, who believe that personnel policies and educational policies in school systems will be increasingly determined not by school boards but by teacher contracts. School boards unskilled in the mysteries of collective bargaining will not long retain their innocence or their power. The days of simple board discretion, and hierarchial authority, over school matters are dead.

If professional administrators and teachers are gaining power relative to the school board, so are militant parents, pupils, and pressure groups, along with their satraps and surrogates in the form of politicians and police. Anyone associated with junior and senior high schools these days can take a searing course in political theory simply by observing what goes on in the corridors, in the cafeterias, and in the principal's office — that is, if one can get past the barricades. It is ironic that schools and colleges, symbolically devoted as they are to reason, should be the first great battleground of contemporary social passion. Whether this is a tribute to education's importance, or simply to the fact that schools and colleges are built to house youthful energies that now have been set afire, is not clear. But no one will pretend that school boards and supervisory personnel have had their authority and discretion enhanced by the assaults from without, or the altercations from within, that have marked the past months and years in schools across the nation. If school boards have refined their techniques for conflict avoidance, it is little to be wondered. There is a surfeit of conflict around these days.

Actually, what has changed is not that conflicts used not to exist, but do now. What is new is that latent conflicts have become overt, deferential patterns have been shattered, and simple manners have gone to pot. I can remember when I was a boy that a tough kid from Cork City, the shanty Irish section of Newton, Massachusetts, once shouted an obscenity at my seventh grade science teacher. In my then youthful estimation, the obscenity had a certain justification because the teacher was a notorious neurotic and autocrat. But the kid was severely disciplined and, after repeated offenses of a similar nature, was later expelled. Today, school board members, principals, and teachers, are rapidly becoming shock-proof. Actually, some of them have become adept at fighting verbal fire with verbal fire. While crossing picket lines during teacher's strikes, more than one lady teacher had had her true profession questioned; more than one male has had questions raised about his genealogy. In any case, the notion that a youth might be severely disciplined or expelled from school because he had used a particular Anglo-Saxon word, would today be unthinkable.

But with the vulgarization of language and manners, has come an assertion of private power against duly constituted public power. All kinds of groups are running around with sets of non-negotiable demands in their raised fists. I am sure that more than one principal, superintendent, or school board member during the past several months would have manifested a secret envy had he been aware of the message sent by the Warden and Fellows of Wadham College, Oxford, to a group of students who had just transmitted a set of non-negotiable demands.

Dear Gentlemen, [the message read] we note your threat to take what you call 'direct action' unless your demands are immediately met. We feel that it is only sporting to let you know that our governing body includes three experts in chemical warfare, two ex-commandos skilled with dynamite and torturing prisoners, four qualified marksmen in both small arms and rifles, two ex-artillery men, one holder of the Victoria Cross, four karate experts, and a chaplain. The governing body has authorized me to tell you that we look forward with confidence to what you call a 'confrontation'; and I may say even with anticipation.[20]

Oxford colleges may still be able to contain their squabbles through this kind of arcane humor. Alas, our school squabbles spill over into the avenues and streets of tense metropolitan communities. The tendency of school boards and their professional staffs is either to give in, in the interest of domestic tranquility; or to call out the cops, in the interest of law and order. Neither seems to work very well, and school boards often end up by looking silly. Looking silly is not good for either status or authority.

The melancholy answer to the question "Who's in charge?" is that no one really is at the moment; and this has a corollary which is that if pluralism degenerates very far into anarchic behavior, someone will jolly-well *take* charge — and we will all be sorry. The denigration and undermining of legitimate authority leads not to democracy but to illegitimate and repressive authority.

Decalogue for Board Members

If the four "R's" of race, resources, relationships, and rule are the new agenda for school boards, what do these issues suggest for "new dimensions in school board leadership?"

The following decalogue addressed to school board members is tentative. I am not God and you are not Moses. But perhaps a few "shalts" and "shalt-nots" may help us to sort out some of the needs and obligations ahead.

I. Thou shalt value and protect the integrity of the human rainbow; and thou shalt innovate and evaluate, evaluate and innovate until the manifest inequities in thy school system are corrected.

II. Thou shalt not cast aspersions on politicians, for such aspersions are on thyself.

III. Thou shalt love thy state and thy nation as thy local school district.

IV. Thou shalt not duck the responsibility to tax adequately for the support of schools.

V. In order to influence those who are influencing thee, thou shalt make thy weight felt in distant places — especially state capitals and the District of Columbia.

VI. Thou shalt recognize the legitimacy of many agencies and groups being involved in school business, and shalt cooperate with them to the advantage of the children in thy district.

VII. Thou shalt choose thy staff with care, and chastise them for administrative waste as well as for the use of gobbledy-gook.

VIII. Thou shalt be slow to anger, quick to understand, flexible in tactics, and firm in principle when bargaining and negotiating with others.

IX. Thou shalt support the moral courage of thy superintendent and the academic freedom of thy teachers against all comers — and they will be many.

X. Thou shalt gird up thy loins; and when the darkness towers, and the winds screech, and the Earth trembles, thou shalt say, "I am a man."

My faith is that if school board members across this country attempt to live up to a decalogue of this kind, local school boards can have an enormous and positive effect not only upon education, but upon the health of community life more generally throughout this troubled nation.

Over a century ago, Emerson said it all for us: "Great men," he wrote, "great nations, have not been boasters and buffoons, but perceivers of the terror of life, and have manned themselves to face it."[21]

But why should school board members attempt the wearying task of negotiating the troubled waters ahead? Why spend countless hours on confrontations and conflict, and laborious and thankless reconciliations?

The answer is simple and overwhelmingly persuasive. It was stated with great eloquence by John Adams nearly two centuries ago:

I must study politics and war, that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy . . . in order to give their children the right to study painting, poetry, and music.[22]

Adams simply underestimated the time it would take.

NOTES

[1] (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958).

[2] *The American High Schools Today* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959).

[3] "The Challenge Facing Lay Control of Public Education" (pamphlet), (Evanston, Illinois: National School Boards Association, 1966).

[4] *The School Board*, Third Printing, (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, December, 1967).

[5] For a signal exception see Michael D. Usdan, "The Changing Politics of Education: A Primer for School Boards Members in New York State" (unpublished), a working resource document prepared for the School Boards Change Agent Project of the City University of New York, Summer, 1968.

[6] Quoted in *Administrator's Notebook*, XVII (April, 1969), 4.

[7] Lipham, Gregg and Rossmiller, *Administrator's Notebook*, XVII (April, 1969), 3.

[8] The Board of Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, *Minutes*, November 12, 1968, 13.

[9] Board of Education, Buffalo, New York, *Summary of Minutes of Board Meeting*, submitted by Isabell Vervaeke, Assistant Secretary to Dr. Joseph Manch, Superintendent of Schools, April 23, 1969, 2.

[10] Board of Education, Buffalo, New York, *Summary of Minutes*, April 23, 1969, 2.

[11] The School District of Philadelphia, *Minutes*, September 9, 1968, 653.

[12] Board of Education, Saint Paul, Minnesota, *Minutes of Regular Meeting*, April 1, 1969, 2.

[13] Board of Education, San Diego, California, *Minutes of Regular Meeting*, March 25, 1969, 532.

[14] Board of Education, San Diego, California, *Minutes*, March 25, 1969, 532.

[15] Board of Education, Rochester, New York, *Minutes of Adjourned Regular Board Meeting*, August 22, 1968, 2.

[16] Metropolitan Public Schools Board, Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, *Minutes*, May 13, 1969, 413.

[17] The School Board of the City of Norfolk, Virginia, *Minutes*, January 9, 1969, 321.

[18] Board of Education, Detroit, Michigan, *Minutes of Regular Meeting*, June 25, 1968, 687.

[19] Board of Education, Columbus, Ohio, *Minutes of Regular Session*, March 18, 1969, 150

[20] John Fischer, "The Easy Chair," *Harper's*, CCIX (July, 1969), 15.

[21] *Emerson's Works* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1924), 188.

[22] Quoted in *This Week* magazine, July 3, 1960, 8.

Part II

The Workbook

For Group Discussion: Topics and Quotations

Suggestion: This workbook section is designed to make this book more useful as a medium of study and discussion at regional, state, and national school board clinics and workshops and by preservice and inservice classes in school administration. Users of the workshop section are invited to report their reactions to and experiences with this book as a means of stimulating dialog by filling out and returning the clip-out form on page 117.

TOPICS

Chapter 1 summarizes eight major ideas that emerged from Chicago Seminar discussions. Each of these ideas is worthy of frank and full exploration via panel presentations or study group activities. Encourage panelists and reactors to put special emphasis on the local and state implications and applications of each idea. Encourage too the formulation of action plans at the local and state level.

1. *School boards must be positive forces for advancing the ideal of the open society in America.*

2. *School boards must lead the way in the creation of a more human educational system.*

3. *School boards must become managers of social change and controversy.*

4. *The school board must work creatively with many other agencies that are also in the "education business."*

5. *School boards must use political muscle in getting the money needed for education.*

6. *School boards working together must guide and goad the universities into producing the kind of school executive talent the times demand.*

7. *School boards must help recruit, train, and find ways to retain the kind of board members the times demand.*

8. *School boards must hold themselves chiefly accountable for the quality of public education.*

QUOTATIONS

Chapters 2 through 6 contain the papers prepared especially for the Chicago Seminar. Below are sample quotations from each of these papers. Use the quotations as discussion-starters at group meetings. Ask: How do these observations apply locally? What steps do they suggest for further local study and action?

1. The Passive School Board

"There is a need for setting goals, establishing policies, and evaluating results. Policy is not developed ordinarily by school boards but reacted to upon presentation by the superintendent and voted upon. And local control is to be sat upon." — Fine, pp. 90-91.

2. Who's in Charge?

"The melancholy answer to the question 'Who's in charge?' is that no one really is at the moment; and this has a corollary which is that if pluralism degenerates very far into archaic behavior, someone will jolly-well *take* charge — and we will all be sorry. The denigration and undermining of legitimate authority leads not to democracy but to illegitimate and repressive authority." — Bailey, p. 108.

3. Ideals Denied?

"No doubt there is a mixture of hooliganism, blind self-interest, and mindless militance in some of [the protests city boards face.] If that were all there were to this crisis of authority, one might easily justify a policy of repression and maintenance of the status quo (though that might radicalize the moderates). Indeed there is already evidence of a backlash of groups that have traditionally influenced the schools. But deeper ideological and practical issues underlie the surface protest. The fact is that urban schools today belie the historic ideals of the American common school, which was to be free, under close public control, inclusive of all social groups, of such high quality that parents would want no other, and offering real equality of opportunity to all children." — Tyack, p. 40.

4. The Management of Controversy

"The lesson to be learned from dealing with conflict situations is that prompt diagnosis and quick remedial action on personal behavior problems and potential crisis events is essential, for the most trivial behavior or event can trigger a crisis if not dealt with promptly. Delay permits a snowballing effect, so that a controversy between a pupil and teacher not settled in the classroom adds proponents to each side if it moves to the principal's office. If the principal delays a day, parental proponents are added overnight. If the controversy isn't settled in the principal's office but must go to central administration, more proponents are added, and if the board of education must hold a hearing on the matter, voluntary associations are likely to become interested. If the board fails to find a solution, all of the hobgoblins associated with religious bigotry, racism, political radicalism, and general paranoia are loosed to ride through the community until settlement is made of the enormously expanded controversy at the level of the state education department or in the courts. Thus it pays to have administrators who view every controversy as potentially a supreme court case, and act accordingly to get it settled as near the point of origin as possible. By the same token, board members will be well advised to identify early in his career any administrator with a tendency toward 'passing the buck' and see that he is removed from line responsibility." — James, pp. 64-65.

5. Needed: Representation Plus Leadership

"I suspect board members need to listen more than they do at present. Meetings should somehow deal with policy more and daily operation less. Extensive time demands such as board members serving as members of negotiating teams for weeks on end should be terminated. Board members may have to have more help in sifting out and checking crucial information. Constantly, a board member must seek to understand the big picture and be determined to represent the people of his city in seeking the best possible school programs for the children, youth, and adults of the city. The board member cannot become captive of the superintendent or of the teacher's union or he loses his effectiveness.

"As in all representative government, the board member must represent his constituents, but he must do more. As he learns more about the school enterprise, I hope he will also lead

Clip Here

Readers, May We Have Your Reaction?

The National School Boards Association solicits your reactions to this publication. Would you kindly complete and return this form — or, of you prefer not to clip this page — would you take a moment to respond in a letter or note? Thank you.

1. A major purpose of this publication is to stimulate thinking, dialog, and action at the local and state level regarding the school boards role in an age of change. Is there evidence that this purpose is being achieved in your community? If so, how? ______________________________

   ____

2. How did you acquire or learn about this publication? ______

   ____

3. Have you had occasion to discuss the ideas in this publication with others? If so, was this in a "structured" situation such as a study group, clinic, or workshop? ______________

   ____

4. With what ideas or recommendations in this publication did you find yourself in most agreement? In least agreement?

   ____

   ____

   ____

5. In a sentence, please give your personal evaluation of this publication. ______________________________

   ____

   ____

6. School board members, check here, ________; school administrators, check here, ________; others write in a term that describes your interest in public education (college educator, interested citizen, legislator, PTA official, etc.) ______________

   ____

Fold down, tape edges, stamp, and mail

Clip Here

____

____

____

Stamp

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
1233 Central Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Attn.: Director of Information

Appendix

The Chicago Seminar: The Participants and the Agenda

1. THE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Stephen K. Bailey, chairman, Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation, and Maxwell Professor of Political Science, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs and professor of educational administration in the Maxwell school. He is also a member of the New York State Board of Regents and chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Educational Laboratories. He is past president of the American Society for Public Administration and is currently an officer of the National Academy of Education. He has also been a city mayor and a member of a Presidential Task Force. He is author or co-author of many books including *Schoolmen and Politics* (Syracuse, 1962) and *ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law* (Syracuse, 1968).

Dr. Roald F. Campbell, chairman, Department of Education, and dean, Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago. He is also president of the American Educational Research Association and a charter member of the National Academy of Education. He has been a consultant to numerous school boards, professional organizations, colleges, and the U.S. Office of Education as well as to the governments of Canada and Pakistan. He is a former director of the Midwest Administration Center. His extensive writings include co-authorship of *Educational Administration as a Social Process* (Harper & Row, 1968) and *The Organization and Control of American Schools* (Charles E. Merrill, 1965).

Dr. B. J. Chandler, dean, School of Education, Northwestern University. He is also a consultant to the USOE Bureau of Higher Education, Division of Graduate Programs; a member of the

Advisory Council on Degree Granting Institutions; a member of the Chicago Mayor's Advisory Commission on School Board Nominations; a trustee of the Aerospace Education Foundation; and an editorial advisor to *Education and Urban Society*. His career has included service as executive secretary, Virginia School Boards Association, and as advisor to the Educational Policies Commission. He is author of *Personnel Management in School Administration* (World Book Co., 1955), *Education and the Teacher* (Dodd, Mead, 1961) and co-author of *Education in Urban Society* (Dodd, Mead, 1962).

William E. Dickinson, on leave from Dickinson Associates, educational writers/editors, Waterford, Conn., to serve as development director of the NSBA School Board Policy Service. He is a former assistant to the publisher and managing editor of Croft Educational Services and a former executive committee member of the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education. He is editor of *Successful School Board Practices* (Croft, 1965) as well as author or editor of many special purpose publications on education.

Dr. Norman Drachler, superintendent of schools, Detroit. Particularly active in the fields of civil rights and human relations education, Dr. Drachler has served as consultant to the U.S. Office of Education on Title IV of the Civil Rights Act; as a consultant on school affairs and integration to the school boards of Kansas City, Mo., and Denver; a board member of the National Commission on Education, Anti-Defamation League; and a member of the Michigan State Department of Public Instruction steering committee responsible for developing and writing *Suggested Guidelines for Providing for the Maximal Education of Children of all Races and Creeds in the Schools of Michigan.* He is also a social studies curriculum advisor to the Educational Development Center (a regional laboratory); a member of an HEW Task Force on citizen participation in education; a consultant on Education Professional Development Act programs in school administration; and chairman of an ASCD commission on bias in instructional materials.

Jerry Fine, attorney-at-law, Fine and Pope, Los Angeles. He is also a member of the Board of Education, Inglewood Unified School District, and a director of the California School Boards Association for Los Angeles County. He was a speaker at the Cubberly Conference on "School Boards in an Era of Conflict"; a lay panel chairman of the Exploratory Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education (which led to the formation of the National Assessment Project); past California state chairman, National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools; and a consultant to the U.S. Office of Education in matters relating to the Education Professions Development Act. He is co-author of these documents published jointly by CSBA and the California Association of School Administrators — *The Superintendent-Board Relationship; Employer-Certificated Employee Relationship;* and *Employee Grievance Procedure.*

George Hutt, executive director, Education Council, Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce. He is also a member of the Philadelphia Board of Education. Mr. Hutt has been a consultant to the Department of Justice and to both the regional laboratory program and higher education divisions of the U.S. Office of Education. His public service includes board or committee membership to the Council of Big Cities Boards of Education (NSBA), the Education Task Force of the Urban Coalition, the Great Cities Research Council, the National Association for African-American Education, the Association for Black Leadership in Education, the Advisory Committee on Higher Education (Pennsylvania), and the Vocational Education Advisory Council.

Dr. H. Thomas James, School of Education, Stanford University. His teaching assignments at Stanford have included courses in school administration, school finance, and school law, and his research has included a series of studies of school finance programs as well as the studies of school boards summarized in Chapter 3 herein. He has also served as a school finance consultant to many state boards of education and as education consultant to government agencies as well as to several foreign nations. He is a former assistant state superintendent for finance and research in Wisconsin. Earlier in his career, Dr. James served variously as a secondary school teacher, supervising principal, district superintendent, and city superintendent of schools. He is a member of the National Academy of Education.

Mrs. Leonard L. Mancuso, member, New Jersey State Board of Education, and president of the National School Boards Association, 1967-68. Long active in local, state and national school board affairs, Mrs. Mancuso has traveled extensively in advocating the cause of education and the role of lay boards of education. She has been a county director of audiovisual education in New Jersey for several years, and served the Glassboro, New Jersey, Board of Education as a member and officer for twelve years. In addition, she was active in the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education as a president and committee member. Mrs. Mancuso also headed a 36-member state Committee on Tax Reform and has served on several national committees.

Boardman W. Moore, president, National School Boards Association, and member and former chairman of the Lafayette Elementary School District Board of Trustees, Lafayette, California. Mr. Moore, a facilities planner for Chevron Research, Standard Oil of California, has been active at all levels of education. Prior to election to his local board, he served as president of a local citizens committee and a tax and bond committee. In civic affairs, he has participated in the development of the Bay Area Rapid Transit program in San Francisco. He was instrumental in securing additional foundation funds for low wealth districts and junior colleges through work with the California School Boards Association School Finance Committee.

Dr. L. Gordon Stone, dean, College of Education, and director of the summer session, Wisconsin State University at River Falls, Wisc. He is also a member of the River Falls Board of Education and president of that community's Chamber of Commerce. He has served as president of the Western Wisconsin Association of School Boards; as a member of the WASB professional relations committee; and is co-author of the WASB report, *The Wisconsin Educational Team* (1968). He also headed a state-wide Advisory Committee on Extension for Wisconsin State Colleges and Universities, and he is co-author of *Improving Teacher Education* (Brown, 1957).

William N. Thomas, attorney-at-law, and vice president (and former president) of the Toledo Board of Education. Mr. Thomas is also a member of the Ohio Manpower Advisory Committee. He is active in the affairs of the Ohio School Boards Association, the Council of Big Cities Boards of Education (NSBA), and the NAACP. Mr. Thomas has also been a member of numerous public service boards and committees including the Council of Social Agencies in Toledo, the Toledo Board of Health, the Toledo Council of World Affairs, the Toledo Boys Club as well as the Red Cross and the Boy Scouts of America.

Dr. David B. Tyack, in July, 1969, at the time of the Chicago Seminar, associate professor of the history of education, University of Illinois; now, associate professor of education and history, Stanford University. Dr. Tyack has been a consultant to the Portland Public Schools, the Stanford Teacher Leadership Development Institute, and to the Danforth Foundation. He has also served as a member of the National Humanities Faculty. He is the author of numerous articles as well as these books — *Nobody knows: Black Americans in the Twentieth Century* (Macmillan. 1969), *Turning Points in American Educational History* (Blaisdell, 1967), and *George Ticknor and the Boston Brahmins* (Harvard University Press, 1967).

Dr. Harold V. Webb, executive director, National School Boards Association, former school administrator, and executive secretary of the Wyoming School Boards Association. As NSBA executive director for the past eight years, he has been responsible for the overall growth and developement of the Association. Under his direction and guidance, NSBA established a Washington, D.C. office and greatly expanded all of its services and programs. He is active in numerous educational and civic activities at local, state and national levels. He represents NSBA on the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States, is active in programs of the American Society of Association Executives, and maintains liaison with other major national organizations.

2. THE AGENDA

TIME AND PLACE: July 9-12, 1969
Marriott Motor Hotel, Chicago

FIRST EVENING

Official Welcome: Mr. Moore

About the Seminar: Dr. Webb

SECOND DAY

Directions from the Moderator: Dr. Chandler

First Paper: "Needed: The Reform of a Reform," Dr. Tyack

Reaction: Mr. Hutt

Second Paper, "School Boards: Functional and Fiscal Relationships," Dr. James

Reaction: Mrs. Mancuso

Third Paper: "The Board's Role: Present and Future," Mr. Fine

Reaction: Dr. Drachler

THIRD DAY

Fourth Paper: "New Dimensions in School Board Leadership," Dr. Bailey

Reaction: Mr. Thomas

Fifth Paper: "City School Boards: What Can Be Done," Dr. Campbell

Reaction: Dr. Stone

FOURTH DAY

Presentation of Overview Ideas: Mr. Dickinson

Concluding Discussion

NOTICE: Both typewritten and audio taped transcripts of the Chicago Seminar are on file at the office of the National School Boards Association, 1233 Central Street, Evanston, Ill. 60201. Libraries and other institutions may arrange for the copying or purchasing of transcripts by contacting the Director of Information.

Stephen K. Bailey

Roald F. Campbell

B. J. Chandler

William E. Dickinson

Norman Drachler

Jerry Fine

George Hutt

H. Thomas James

Ruth Mancuso

Boardman W. Moore

L. Gordon Stone

William N. Thomas

David B. Tyack

Harold V. Webb

NSBA